JESUS AS SHEPHERD

IN THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

Fr. Terry J. Hedrick

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Theology and Religion
Durham University
2007

JESUS AS SHEPHERD IN THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

Fr. Terry J. Hedrick

Thesis Abstract

The aim of this thesis is to demonstrate that Matthew and those who first received and transmitted Matthew's Gospel during the late first century believed that Jesus was the righteous and royal Shepherd-Messiah of Israel, the Son of David. Matthew also believed that Jesus was the true teacher and interpreter of the law who could give definitive leadership and guidance to Israel in the aftermath of the Jewish war. Matthew's Gospel was written sometime during the last quarter of the first century, during the formative period of early Judaism. In this context, Matthew presented Jesus as the defining figure for the future of Israel. Jesus, as the righteous royal shepherd, will provide the authoritative understanding of Judaism and her traditions. Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of David, and fulfills the promises of the Hebrew Scriptures. Therefore, as God's choice, he is the one to be turned to during this time of transition and change. As the Son of God and Messiah, he has been given God's authority and is personally present with the community to give this guidance.

One of the ways the evangelist demonstrates this is in his use of the shepherd metaphor in regard to Jesus. The ancient metaphor of shepherd was an image for leadership in the history of the tradition. The shepherd metaphor was often associated with the spiritual and national leaders in Israel, for example, Moses and David. According to Matthew qualities of this kind of shepherd leadership are now revealed in their fullness in Jesus, the Son of God. Jesus as Shepherd-Messiah is revealed both explicitly and implicitly in Matthew. He is revealed explicitly in the shepherd texts of Matthew and implicitly in the Gospel through the literary and typological correspondences in the history of Israel.

The shepherd metaphor has a long history both inside and outside Israel's tradition. Kings and rulers of many types were referred to as shepherds. In the thesis, the metaphor is explored in the Ancient Near East generally, the biblical tradition, second Temple Judaism, the Dead Sea Scrolls and Philo. The shepherd metaphor was also used to describe evil, false or abusive rulers and leaders. In Israel's tradition this false shepherd metaphor became especially prominent in the exilic and post-exilic prophets. After the time of the exile, messianic hopes grew. The shepherd metaphor became associated with these messianic expectations. Other relevant texts from Rabbinic Judaism and Greco-Roman sources are also considered.

In light of this social and historical background, the intertextual and narrative implications of Matthew's use of the shepherd motif will be investigated in relation to his christological concerns.

Finally, the shepherd metaphor as it is applied to 'Jesus as shepherd' is thoroughly examined in regard to the Gospel of Matthew. It is the intention of this thesis therefore to make a contribution concerning Matthew's use of the shepherd metaphor in the wider context of Matthean Christology.

Declaration

I hereby declare that no part of the material contained in this thesis has previously been submitted for a degree in any other University or College.

Copyright

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without the support of many colleagues, friends and family. With that realization, I would like to acknowledge those who helped make it possible.

Dr. Stephen C. Barton, my supervisor and advisor who worked tirelessly with me over the many years of this process. Stephen was personally involved with me and gave me specific guidance and support without which I could not have completed this thesis. Not only was he an advisor extraordinaire in this intellectual endeavor, but also a mentor and friend throughout the whole of life providing emotional and spiritual support as well. I cannot thank him enough.

My examiners, Dr. William Telford and Professor John Riches, for their willingness to participate in this process. I would like to thank them for their scholarly example and for the helpful feedback they provided. Also, Professor Loren Stuckenbruck for his guidance and continual support throughout my time at Durham and for his encouragement to pursue publishing the thesis when completed.

My beloved bishop, Bishop Michael B. Davidson, ICCEC, for his unconditional support and encouragement throughout the research and writing of this thesis.

My dear friend and partner in Christian ministry, The Rev. Jeff Gannon, UMC. This thesis could not have been completed without the support of Rev. Gannon and the entire congregation at Chapel Hill Fellowship, UMC. Not only did Jeff provide personal encouragement but he gave me time at several critical junctures in which to focus on my research and writing. The entire congregation at Chapel Hill Fellowship was interested in and encouraged this endeavor for which I will always be deeply grateful. Specific congregational members read the thesis in part or in its entirety. I would like to thank each of them: Dr. Ernie Rieger, MD who met regularly with me to discuss the thesis and who made many helpful suggestions, especially with the Hebrew text; Dr. Chuck Schalon and Lori Shunk who proof-read the thesis and offered helpful suggestions.

Dr. Steve Rankin, Southwestern College, who offered both friendship and intellectual dialog which stimulated me at several times of blockage.

Dr. Jerry Truex who paved the way before me at Durham University and so offered helpful insight and focus along the way. I especially appreciated his dialogue with the penultimate draft. He was a God-send in helping me over that initial hurdle.

Dr. Al Gregg, Wichita State University, who interacted with Chapter 3 on Metaphor.

My longtime friend, Professor Dale C. Allison, who many years ago inspired me to focus on Matthew's Gospel through his own incredible scholarly work and influence.

Also, many thanks to the staff of Edmond Stanley Library at Friends University for their tireless efforts to locate books and articles through Inter-Library Loan.

Last, but not least, I dedicate the thesis to my family. My oldest daughter, Jaimee Anne whose calls provided hope on a daily basis and light when the path was dark. My youngest daughter, Tera Lee whose interest in my scholarly work and her willingness to listen and dialogue gave the task a joy and purpose beyond what she will ever know. Finally, to my wife, Julie, who has always supported and encouraged me to pursue my goals. She believed in me when I didn't believe in myself. She not only supported me emotionally and financially in this endeavor but also in many practical ways, along with hours of proof reading when it came time to submit the final product.

I give thanks to all of these and to God, who has made himself known to us in Jesus and from whom all good things come. To him be the Glory.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

The Bibliographic style and most of the abbreviations in this thesis are those recommended by the Society of Biblical Literature, *The SBL Handbook of Style,* published by Hendrickson, 1999. The following abbreviations are used in the footnotes for commonly-cited works.

ABD	*Anchor Bible Dictionary.* Edited by D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York, 1992.
ANET	*Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament.* Edited by J. B. Pritchard. 3d ed. Princeton, 1969.
BDAG	Bauer, W., F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* 3rd ed. Chicago, 1999.
BDB	Brown, F., S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament.* Oxford, 1907.
BDF	Blass, F., A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* Chicago, 1961.
EDNT	*Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament.* Edited by H. Balz, G. Schneider. ET. Grand Rapids, 1990-1993.
HALOT	Koehler, L., W. Baumgartner, and J. J. Stamm, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament.* Translated and edited under the supervision of M. E. J. Richardson. 4 vols. Leiden, 1994-1999.
LEH	Lust, Johan, Erik Eyrikel, and Katrin Hauspie. Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint. Revised Edition. Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft. 2003.
LSJ	Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, H. S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon.* 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford, 1996.
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.* Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids, 1964-1976.
TDOT	*Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament.* Edited by G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. Translated by J. T. Willis, G. W. Bromiley and D. E. Green. 14 vols. Grand Rapids, 1974-2004.
TLNT	*Theological Lexicon of the New Testament.* C. Spicq. Translated and edited by J. D. Ernest. 3 vols. Peabody, Mass., 1994.

TLOT	*Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament.* Edited by E. Jenni, with assistance from C. Westermann. Translated by M. E. Biddle. 3 vols. Peabody, Mass., 1997.
TWOT	*Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament.* Edited by R. L. Harris, G. L. Archer Jr. 2 vols. Chicago, 1980.

Major Commentaries Consulted (see the Bibliography for full citations):

Davies & Allison 1, 2, 3	Davies, W.D. and Dale C. Allison. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Gospel According to Saint Matthew.* 3 vols. The International Critical Commentary Series. Edinburgh, 1988-1997.
Hagner 1, 2	Hagner, Donald A. *World Biblical Commentary: Matthew.* 2 vols. Dallas, 1993-1995.
Holladay 1, 2	Holladay, William L. *A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah* . Hermeneia-A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. 2 vols. Philadelphia 1986-1989.
Lundbom 1, 2, 3	Lundbom, Jack. *A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary: Jeremiah.* The Anchor Bible. 3 vols. New York, 1999-2004.
Luz 1, 2, 3	Luz, Ulrich. *A Commentary of the Gospel of Matthew.* Hermeneia-A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. 3 vols. Minneapolis, 1989-2005.
Zimmerli 1, 2	Zimmerli, Walter. *A Commentary of the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel.* Hermeneia-A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. 2 vols. Philadelphia 1979-1983.

NRSV: New Revised Standard Version is used for English Bible quotations.
NA$^{27:}$ Nestle-Aland 27th edition is used for the Greek NT.
BHS: Biblia Heraica Stuttgartensia is used for the Hebrew OT.

INTRODUCTION

This thesis will demonstrate that Matthew the evangelist believed that Jesus was the Shepherd-Messiah, specifically the righteous and royal Shepherd-Messiah come from God, to give leadership and guidance in the aftermath of the devastating events of the Roman war with the Jews in 66-70 C.E.[1] Matthew wrote during a time of crisis and transition for Judaism. Some Jews were searching for leadership and direction and some found it in what would later be known as Rabbinic Judaism. In this context, the Evangelist believes he knows who and how leadership should be redefined in light of this crisis. Jesus as the Shepherd-Messiah, the Son of David and Son of God, comes in fulfillment of the promises in the Hebrew Scriptures. He is the one chosen by God to give the new and authoritative interpretation of the law, to clarify the identity of the new community of the people of God and to define the nature of renewed leadership that should serve the new community.

When I began this thesis several years ago, my interest in the shepherd metaphor was primarily personal and practical. I had been in parish ministry for twenty-five years and had just resigned from a church that I had pastored for almost eighteen years. At that time, I was interested primarily in the shepherd metaphor and its connection to a biblical understanding of leadership. This time of transition allowed me to reflect on those years of pastoral leadership: How had my leadership been effective? How had my leadership been ineffective or even detrimental? Where had I received my guidance for my leadership style? Was I following what Jesus did and taught in the Gospels? These questions were fresh on my mind as I began to probe the shepherd metaphor in hopes that it might give me a fuller understanding of biblical leadership.

---

[1] The social context of the Gospel will be discussed further in Chapter 2 and Chapter 7.

My second interest at the time was with Matthew's Gospel and his considerable skills as a communicator as illustrated by his literary techniques, techniques I still find remarkable. I came to appreciate: 1) his repetition of favorite words, phrases, formulas and whole sentences; 2) his utilization of the *inclusion,* and *chiasmus;* 3) his use of framing, not just with formulas or the *inclusion*, but by making use of whole pericopes or narrative events in order to establish a theological theme; 4) his collection of *like* material; for example, miracle stories, sayings of Jesus and parables; 5) his application of triads; 6) his drawing upon 'Matthean vocabulary' to cross reference to other passages in the Gospel by echoing similar themes through verbal allusion; 7) his application of these literary techniques whereby he creates structural markers that sometimes run throughout the Gospel. These are only some of the ways that Matthew uses his literary genius in the composition of his Gospel.

But as I studied Matthew, I found that equal to his communication skills were his pastoral skills. He sets forth the story and significance of Jesus in a way that is uniquely relevant to his readers in order to give them guidance and spiritual direction in light of their contemporary crisis of leadership. He provided the Jewish Christians of his day the perspective and tools they needed to help them form their own spiritual identity in relation to their Jewish heritage. In addition to this specific personal relevance and application, he also deals with broad pastoral and catechetical concerns. By his leadership, he helps the Jewish community embrace the leadership and guidance that Jesus the Shepherd-Messiah offers them.

These interests persist to this day as I continue to engage in full time pastoral work along with teaching responsibilities. But as the thesis progressed it became apparent to me that the 'shepherd texts,' as I refer to them, were larger and more

significant than I originally anticipated since they are a part of Matthew's extensive use of scriptural tradition.

In order to appreciate Matthew's perspective concerning Jesus as the Shepherd-Messiah and specifically his use of the shepherd motif in regard to Jesus, it became important to understand Matthew's use of the Jewish scriptures in both their Hebrew and Greek forms. Matthew uses some sixty-one quotes from the biblical tradition in his Gospel. According to NA 27th edition, forty of these are explicit citations, or as I call them, 'marked quotations,'[2] and twenty-one of these direct quotations are without explicit citation. When the allusions (which approximate nearly 300) are taken into account, it becomes clear how important the biblical tradition is for Matthew. All of the shepherd texts are either quotations from the biblical tradition or allusions to it. This is another way Matthew lends importance and authority to shepherd motif.[3]

Matthew uses ποιμήν ('shepherd')[4] three times in his Gospel (9:36; 25:32; 26:31) and the verb ποιμαίνω once (2:6).[5] Matthew always uses these terms metaphorically, never literally. The shepherd image is implied in regards to Jesus in 15:24 and 18:12. Through these uses Matthew establishes Jesus as the Shepherd-Messiah.

Matthew has five shepherd texts that describe Jesus in his birth, ministry and death as the messianic shepherd. He employs the shepherd metaphor more than either

---

[2] Allison (2000) x.

[3] Senior (1997) 89. These statistics will differ in some of the details among scholars, e.g. Davies and Allison 1:29-58, 3:573-577, but this only illustrates the difficulty of identifying scriptural citations and especially allusions. The primary point of the statistics is to emphasize that Matthew uses the biblical traditions with an intensity and theological intentionality beyond the other Gospel writers.

[4] ποιμήν, ένος, ὁ *shepherd*—1. lit. Lk 2:8, 15, 18, 20; fig. Mt 9:36 // Mk 6:34; Mt 25:32; Mt 26:31 // Mk 14:27.

[5] ποιμαίνω *herd, tend, (lead to) pasture*—1. lit. *tend sheep* Lk 17:7.—2. fig.—a. in the sense 'lead,' 'guide,' 'rule' Mt 2:6; J 21:16; Ac 20:28; 1 Pt 5:2; Rv 2; 27; 12:5; 19:15.—b. *care for, look after* Jd 12; Rv 7:17.

Mark or Luke. Matthew shares Luke's one reference, the lost sheep parable found in *Q* (Mt 18:12-14//Lk 15:3-7), although Matthew applies the parable differently. With Mark, Matthew shares two references, both from the biblical tradition: (i) the unmarked quote 'sheep without a shepherd' in Mk 6:34//Mt 9:36, intertextually related to Num 27:17; and (ii) Mk 14:27//Mt 26:31 where the shepherd is 'struck' and the sheep are scattered, identified in the marked quote from Zech 13:7. Matthew has two shepherd texts from his own source(s) and alone uses the verb, ποιμαίνω, in the compound quote in 2:6, 'a ruler shall shepherd my people'.[6] This quotation combines the Davidic text of II Sam 5:2 and the shepherd-messiah prophecy of Micah 5:2. In 25:31-32, the 'Son of Man' is described as the shepherd who 'separates the sheep from the goats'. Matthew alone implies that Jesus is the shepherd in the encounter with the 'Canaanite' woman when Jesus says that his mission is 'only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel' (Mk 7:24-30//Mt 15:21-28; cf. Mt 10:6). Matthew also associates the shepherd motif with christological phrases like 'Son of David' and the 'Son of Man', and with typological themes like the 'new Moses' and the 'new David.' Matthew's intertextual use of the biblical tradition is therefore of primary importance in regard to the shepherd texts.

The term *intertextuality* is used as an umbrella term that describes the relationship between previous texts (subtexts) and their use and influence on the current text that quotes or alludes to the previous textual tradition. The meaning of *intertextuality* varies when used by different authors, but in its most comprehensive understanding it may include all potential relationships between texts. The focus here is concerned with 'only one species of intertextuality, namely, deliberate literary borrowing, the sort of borrowing that a text encourages its audience to discover, and

[6] Cf. The two texts are Mic 5:2 and II Sam 5:2.

recognition of which enlarges meaning'.[7] From the standpoint of this thesis, *intertextuality* in Matthew primarily involves the Jewish Scriptures, in both their Hebrew and Greek forms. The Matthean shepherd texts exist as part of a larger Jewish literary tradition.[8] The emphasis here is in regard to the *intertextuality* of the textual tradition.

For Matthew, Jesus, the Son of God and Messiah, was given divine authority by God to interpret afresh the Jewish Scriptures and after his resurrection to be personally present with the new community of God's people in order to provide them with spiritual guidance.[9] The ancient shepherd metaphor, which once was associated with the godly leadership of David and Moses, is now revealed in its fullness in Jesus, the Son of God. This image of Jesus as Israel's shepherd is both explicit and implicit in Matthew's Gospel. The ways in which Jesus is the shepherd are explicitly stated in the shepherd texts of Matthew and implicitly in the typological correspondences in the Gospel.

The shepherd/sheep metaphor in the Gospel is rooted in the rich soil of the Ancient Near East generally and specifically in the biblical tradition and Second Temple Judaism. The metaphor had a positive history in regard to *YHWH* as the shepherd of Israel.[10] There were also important individuals such as the patriarchs, Moses, David and the future Messiah, who are associated with the shepherd metaphor.[11] But, alongside this positive image, a negative use of the metaphor also

---

[7] Allison (2000) ix. Cf. Moyise (2000) 41, '[Intertextuality] is best used as an "umbrella" term for the complex interactions that exist between "texts" (in the broadest sense)'.
[8] While intertextuality has to do primarily with texts, this does not exclude the historical and cultural/social setting of the texts and their sources. This also includes the literary forms, the final literary and canonical shape of the texts and the way the shepherd metaphor is understood in light of this background.
[9] E.g. Mt 1:23, 18:20, 28:20.
[10] E.g. Gen 48:15, 49:24.
[11] E.g. Ez 34:23, 37:24; Ps Sol 17:23-46.

emerged. This negative metaphor coincides with mixed views of the literal practice of shepherding. For instance, laws were enacted to protect against the potential dishonesty of shepherds who were hired to tend the flocks of others.[12] As a metaphor of bad leadership in antiquity the evil shepherd, or anti-shepherd metaphor, whether political or religious, becomes an image for leaders that do not care for or tend those being led. At least from the time of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, evil shepherds who took advantage of, used and abused the sheep/people for personal gain[13] are shown as a problem. The shepherd metaphor was often used in times when there was a crisis of leadership or leadership was being contested. Cultural associations with the actual trade of shepherding also became more negative. During the first century and especially later there is evidence that shepherding as a trade, while necessary, was despised as an occupation linked with thieves and cheats.[14] It is the purpose of this thesis to consider these various traditions and their importance for Matthew.

In the study of Matthew's Gospel, many have emphasized the christological titles of Jesus; Jesus is King of the Jews, Messiah, Son of Man, Son of David and Son of God.[15] Scholars have debated over the importance that Matthew places on any one or combination of these titles. This thesis will argue that Matthew uses the shepherd metaphor to depict Jesus as the 'righteous royal shepherd/leader' who, as the Son of Abraham and in the royal lineage of David (Mt 1:1), will rule/tend the people of God in righteousness and mercy. Matthew contrasts Jesus as the good (true)

---

[12] E.g. Ex 22:9-13 and The Code of Hammurabi *ANET* 177.
[13] E.g. Jer 23, Ez 34.
[14] *m. Qidd.* 4:14. Cf. Jeremias (1975) 303-307. Horsley (1989) 102-03 contends that 'The texts from which these lists are taken are very late, hence not good evidence for the time of Jesus. Equally as important as the dating of evidence should be the social location of evidence. It is unlikely that rabbinic debates on who is ineligible to serve as witnesses in court provide good evidence for whether certain people were despised or hated "by the people"'.
[15] E.g. Davies and Allison 3:718-21; Stanton (1997) 180-85.

shepherd/leader of Israel over against Jewish leaders, who deny his Messiahship and who are characterized as evil (false) shepherds/leaders.

A number of studies concerning the shepherd/sheep metaphor have focused on specific texts throughout Scripture and beyond the biblical materials into the history of the church.[16] Others have restricted themselves to the Gospels in one form or another.[17] A primary focus of research in regard to the shepherd metaphor in the NT has been Jesus the Good Shepherd in John's Gospel.[18] This thesis will seek to clarify the shepherd/sheep metaphor in regard to Jesus as shepherd in the Gospel of Matthew.

The purpose of this thesis is not to argue that the metaphor of Jesus as the righteous royal shepherd is the dominant description of Jesus in Matthew's Gospel. It is one among many of the christological themes that Matthew uses to show that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God.[19] As noted above, Matthew's Christology has often been evaluated on the basis of a study of christological titles and various attempts have been made to identify the most important title.[20] This is not the approach of the present thesis. This thesis hopes to show that the shepherd metaphor deepens Matthew's overall christological concerns. It will be argued that Jesus is the righteous royal shepherd and this christological perspective sheds light on the Son of David theme specifically and other christological themes generally. This thesis will demonstrate that the shepherd/sheep metaphor illuminates and enriches Matthew's central christological concern that Jesus is God's Messiah. Matthew does this by showing

---

[16] E.g. Thomson (1955), Jeremias *(TDNT)* 6:485-502, Beyreuther (1978), Tidball (1986), Winstanley (1986); Sabbe (1991), Bosetti (1993), Soggin (1997), Huntzinger (1999), Lanik (2006).
[17] E.g. Tooley (1964) 15-25; Martin, (1975) 261-301; Heil, (1993) 698-708.
[18] E.g. Beutler and Fortna (1991); Cachia (1997); Kostenberger (2002) 67-96; Sabbe (1991) 75-93.
[19] Davies and Allison (1997) 3:720-21 emphasize that the 'very multiplicity' of titles and typologies, is one of the main ways Matthew makes his point that 'Jesus is larger than all of them'. 'Matthew's narrative serves not to define titles, significant as they are, but to reveal a person who cannot be captured by one label or even by many'.
[20] E.g. the Kingsbury and Hill debate concerning Jesus. Cf. Kingsbury (1984) 22-32, Hill (1984) 48-51, Kingsbury (1985) 68-74.

how Jesus demonstrates the qualities and actions of God's righteous royal shepherd. In the Synoptic tradition, Jesus himself does not often explicitly say that he is the Messiah, although others certainly do. The tradition, however, does present him as doing what the Messiah is thought to or expected to do.[21] This same pattern occurs as regards to the shepherd metaphor. Jesus does not often speak of himself as the shepherd (if at all), but the text certainly implies this. Matthew emphasizes Jesus' actions as fulfilling the expectations as the righteous royal shepherd according to the promises of the biblical tradition. It will be pointed out that the majority of texts indicating Jesus as shepherd are biblical texts applied to Jesus by Matthew. For example, Matthew 2:6 is a marked compound quote from Micah 5:2 and II Samuel 5:2; Matthew 9:36 is an allusion from Numbers 24:17; Matthew 26:31 also a marked quote from Zechariah 13:7. Jesus does indirectly allude to himself as shepherd in Matthew 15:24 and 25:32 which are unique to Matthew.

It will also be argued that the social setting of Matthew's context influences the use of the metaphor. In the social setting of Matthew, the shepherd/sheep metaphor is used to remind Israel generally and his community/communities specifically that Jesus is the righteous royal shepherd and fulfills this role in a way that none have before him. For Matthew, Jesus comes to fulfill and interpret anew the Jewish Scriptures; he comes to save and heal, to deliver and provide guidance, and to remain present with his flock, rather than abusing them or abandoning them.[22]

The study of the shepherd/sheep metaphor will begin by considering the Ancient Near Eastern texts that illustrate the metaphor and its influence especially as it

---

[21] E.g. Peter's confession in Mt 16:13-20; Jesus response to the disciples of John the Baptist in Mt 11:1-15.

[22] Ps 23: *YHWH* provides, protects, heals, and is present with the psalmist even in the midst of deep darkness, possibly a time of personal exile. It will be argued that these attributes are also characteristic of Matthew's understanding of Jesus as the righteous royal shepherd.

relates to the biblical traditions of Israel. The shepherd/sheep texts in the biblical tradition will be dealt with extensively but not exhaustively. This same approach will be taken in regard to the early Jewish texts and those of the Greco-Roman tradition. Finally, Philo and rabbinic materials will be considered. While the rabbinic writings are later than the NT, they will be considered in light of how they might reflect the late first century understanding of the metaphor in Judaism. By drawing upon these various textual traditions, the metaphor will be explored in such a way as to help clarify more fully the different dimensions of Jesus as shepherd in the Gospel of Matthew.

In sum, this study has five purposes and one clear qualification.

1) To demonstrate the Matthew believed that Jesus was the Shepherd-Messiah, specifically the righteous and royal Shepherd-Messiah, who comes to give leadership to the people of God in the aftermath of the Jewish War. Matthew presented Jesus as the defining figure for the future of Israel.

2) To consider the various shepherd/sheep traditions and their importance for Matthew.

3) To clarify the shepherd/sheep metaphor in regard to Jesus as shepherd in Matthew's Gospel.

4) To show that Matthew's use of the shepherd metaphor for Jesus deepens Matthean Christological concerns.

5) To show that Matthew's social context influences the use of the metaphor.

6) There is one clear qualification concerning this study of Jesus as shepherd. It is not intended to argue that the metaphor of the righteous royal shepherd is the dominant description of Jesus in Matthew.

CHAPTER 1
HISTORY OF RESEARCH

This chapter will review two types of pertinent research from selected works. Type 1 are studies that deal with the shepherd/sheep metaphor generally in the Old and New Testament and specifically contain a discussion on the Gospels, Synoptic Gospels and/or Matthew. Type 2 are studies that deal with the shepherd/sheep metaphor in Matthew specifically. Other works relating to the shepherd/sheep image, for example from John's Gospel, have not been included in the attempt to focus primarily on Matthew's use of the metaphor. Likewise, specialized studies that address the shepherd/sheep metaphor will be considered throughout the thesis in appropriate sections.[23] The scholars chosen for review have been selected because they represent seminal work (e.g. Jeremias[24]), consider Matthew's use of the metaphor as part of their larger work (e.g. Cachia[25], Hutzinger[26] Laniak[27]), or represent the state of research in regard to the metaphor in Matthew specifically (e.g. Tooley[28], Martin[29], Heil[30]).

1.1 Joachim Jeremias

Jeremias' original German article on ποιμήν in *TDNT* provides a class analysis of the shepherd/sheep word group. Jeremias' article ranges from the ANE, the biblical tradition, Judaism, the NT and the early church. He assumes the metaphorical use which he calls 'transferred usage'. The article has no stated theory of metaphor. Beginning in the ANE he provides illustrations from ancient royal Sumerian,

---

[23] E.g. Moss (1992) 218-223; Ham (2005) 115-120. Both deal with Matthew's use of Zechariah.
[24] Jeremias ποιμήν *TDNT* 485-502.
[25] Cachia (1997) 85-95.
[26] Hutzinger (1999) 195-218, 226-244.
[27] Laniak (2006) 182-194.
[28] Tooley (1964).
[29] Martin (1975) 261-301.
[30] Heil (1993) 698-708.

Babylonian, Assyrian and Egyptian materials.[31] He discusses the 'transferred usage' (his way of referring to metaphor though he gives no explanation about metaphor) in regard to *YHWH* as shepherd. Jeremias notes that shepherd terms are used concerning the Exodus/wilderness motif but he cautions 'it is hard to determine' to what extent the shepherd/sheep metaphor is at work.[32] He makes the important point that the term *shepherd* is never used as an official title for a specific ruling king in Israel.[33] However, Jeremias does make a distinction. He argues that collective use of the term *shepherds* is commonly used to describe groups of political and military leaders, especially from Jeremiah on.[34] Jeremias goes on to claim that in Israel, different from the ANE generally, *YHWH* alone is the true shepherd and those who serve in leadership are legitimate shepherds to the extent that they follow *YHWH* as shepherd. This allows for the possibility of unfaithful shepherds who are indicted by the later exilic and postexilic prophets. In response to this crisis of leadership, *YHWH* will take over the office of shepherd and appoint better shepherds[35] and will finally send the ultimate shepherd who will be 'the future Messianic Son of David'.[36] Jeremias develops the Shepherd-Messiah theme, albeit briefly, from the time of Jeremiah through Deutero-Zechariah to the NT. Up to this point, Jeremias is in line with the general consensus of scholarship and his work has withstood the test of time. I agree with his observations to this point and will develop and expand his more general

---

[31] Jeremias *TDNT* 6:486. This usage will be explored more fully below in 'Ancient Near Eastern Background'.
[32] Jeremias *TDNT* 6:487.
[33] Jeremias *TDNT* 6:487-488. He makes a clarification concerning David, n 30: 'It is quite early said of David that he "tends" Israel (2 Sam 5:2 par. 1 Chr 11:2; Ps 78:71f) and the people is called by him a flock (2 Sam 24:17 par. 1 Chr 21:17), but the royal title "shepherd" does not occur'.
[34] He notes: I Sam 21:8; II Sam 7:7 par. I Chr 17:6; Jer 2:8, 3:15, 10:21, 22:22, 23:1-4, 25:34-36, 50:6; Ezek 34:2-10; Is 56:11; Mic 5:4; Zech 10:3, 11:5f., 16. Foreign rulers are also called 'shepherds' in Jer 25:34-36; Na 3:18; Is 44:28 HT (Yahwah calls Cyrus 'my shepherd'; the LXX avoids this expression).
[35] Jeremias *TDNT* 6:488. He notes: Jer 3:15, 23:4; Ez 34:23f, 37:22, 37:24.
[36] Jeremias *TDNT* 6:488.

observations, exploring the use of the shepherd metaphor within themes of contested leadership and/or leadership crises in the biblical tradition and in Matthew.

When considering later Judaism, Jeremias emphasizes the negative attitude toward shepherds.[37] The primary sources here are late, coming from the *Mishnah, Talmud* and the *Tosefta.*[38] For instance, Jeremias notes the negative comments of the *Midrash* on Psalm 23 where the rabbis find it amazing that God is likened to shepherds, who are by nature despicable.[39] All these sources emphasize the discrimination against shepherds during this later period. While much of Jeremias' work remains relevant, this portion of his work has been revised in later years as recent scholars have questioned the status of shepherds in the first century.[40] It is the lateness of these sources that have called into question their relevance to NT studies and cause me to modify some of his findings throughout the thesis.

In spite of Jeremias' interest in the negative attitude towards shepherds supported by later evidence, Jeremias seems to maintain a positive reading of the shepherd metaphor in situations where it seems more likely to be negative, such as *I Enoch* 85-90. Jeremias' reading of this passage will be challenged in Chapter Six below when *I Enoch* is considered. There it will be argued that the metaphor is probably pejorative and the shepherd designation appears to be intentionally avoided in regard to *YHWH*, who is never 'the shepherd' or 'the shepherd of Israel', but always 'the Lord of the sheep'. The treatment of this passage proves helpful in understanding Jeremias' negative development of shepherd. We must modify Jeremias' theories due

---

[37] Jeremias *TDNT* 6:488-489.
[38] *m. Qidd.* 4:14; *b. Sanh.* 25b; *B. Qam.* 10:9; *t. B. Qam.* 11:9.
[39] Jeremias *TDNT* 6:489, n 42: *Midrash* on Ps 23, 'No position in the world is so despised as that of the shepherd'.
[40] Horsley (1989) 102-03 contends that 'The texts from which these lists are taken are very late, hence not good evidence for the time of Jesus. Equally as important as the dating of evidence should be the social location of evidence. It is unlikely that rabbinic debates on who is ineligible to serve as witnesses in court provide good evidence for whether certain people were despised or hated "by the people"'.

to the lateness of his sources while still acknowledging evidence that suggests that after the exile the profession and associations with shepherding had increasingly negative connotations.

Before concluding his material on Judaism, Jeremias highlights two texts of particular importance for the NT: Qumran, CD 13:7-10 and *Psalms of Solomon* 17:40. The comparison of the leader of the Qumran community to a shepherd, according to Jeremias, 'is the closest analogy to the similar statements in the NT'.[41] In regard to *Psalms of Solomon*, he emphasizes that this text indicates that the Messiah was associated with the shepherd metaphor and was known to pre-Christian Judaism. Finally, he devotes a paragraph to Philo and notes his allegorical ('poetic') usage in which the νοῦς is expounded as the shepherd of the irrational powers of the soul.[42] Philo also uses the image of a shepherd watching over his flock (*Leg. Gaj.*, 44) to describe how a ruler leads his people. Consistent with a universal observation, he even says that shepherding prepares one for leadership (*Vit. Mos.*, I, 60ff.; Jos. 2).[43]

In regard to the NT, Jeremias begins with the observation that Jesus uses the shepherd image in his parables when referring to God; for example, see Lk 15:4-7 par. Mt 18:12-14. Because of his understanding of 'Pharisaic Rabbinism,' Jeremias is surprised by this much like the Rabbis themselves are surprised by *Midrash* on Psalm 23. Forced to reconcile Jesus' positive references to shepherds with the negative rabbinic attitudes, he suggests that Jesus connects God with the shepherd as part of his larger practice of esteeming and identifying with the lowly.[44] This interpretation, of course, depends upon a presupposition of a universal negative understanding of the

---

[41] Jeremias *TDNT* 6:489.
[42] Jeremias *TDNT* 6:490.
[43] Jeremias *TDNT* 6:490. (*Leg. Gaj.*, 44 = *Legat.* 44; *Vit. Mos.*, I, 60ff.; *Jos.*, 2 = *Moses* 1, 60ff.; *Joseph*, 2.) This will be discussed below in chapters 4 and 5.
[44] Jeremias *TDNT* 6:490.

shepherd. I believe a more convincing interpretation for the reason God is never addressed as shepherd in the NT is that it becomes a christological statement relating Jesus to God as the promised Shepherd-Messiah.[45]

According to Jeremias, Jesus understands himself to be the Shepherd-Messiah on the basis of the promise of the Messianic Shepherd in the OT.[46] Jeremias makes three observations about how Jesus identifies himself as the Shepherd-Messiah.[47] First, Jesus explains his mission. He uses the shepherd image to explain that he will gather the scattered people of God, because he has been sent to 'the lost sheep of the house of Israel' (Mt 10:6, 15:24).[48] Jeremias understands these texts as 'ancient Aramaic tradition'. This restriction to the Jews only will give way to salvation for all the nations after the resurrection. This universal salvation will be explained according to Jeremias by 'the fact that Jesus expected the integration of the Gentiles into the people of God in the form of the eschatological pilgrimage of the nations to the Mount of God'.[49] Second, Jesus used the metaphor to imply his death and resurrection (Mk 14:27-28//Mt 26:31-32).[50] Mk 14:27//Mt 26:31 is a marked quote ('it is written') from Zechariah 13:7. The LXX of Zechariah 13:7 has 'smite' (πατάξατε, imp. aor.) whereas Mark 14:27 changes it to 'I (God) will smite' (πατάξω, fut. ind.), which Matthew follows. On this basis, Jeremias argues that this change connects the shepherd motif with the suffering servant motif in Is 53:6b. So, the shepherd metaphor is a basic image implying Jesus' death and resurrection.[51] The third assertion is that, on the

---

[45] Jeremias *TDNT* 6:491.
[46] Jeremias *TDNT* 6:492
[47] Jeremias *TDNT* 6:492-93. Cf. Jeremias (1967) 19f, 25-30. He develops these points in much greater detail in the monograph, *Jesus' Promise to the Nations.*
[48] Jeremias *TDNT* 6:500, n. 17.
[49] Jeremias *TDNT* 6:492.
[50] Jeremias *TDNT* 6:492.
[51] Jeremias *TDNT* 6:493. n.78, 'The smitten Shepherd is the Servant of the Lord. God vicariously lays on him the judgment which should have smitten the whole flock'.

basis of Mt 25:32 and Lk 12:32, Jesus is the one who will execute the 'eschatological judgment' and the scattered nations will be gathered like a flock to enter the kingdom.[52] These three points are generally helpful and each will be further explored and expanded in Chapter 8.

Throughout his work, the great strength of Jeremias' contribution is his identification of the primary texts and his discussion of the development of the shepherd motif in the biblical tradition. Likewise, he also points out some of the unique ways that the biblical tradition utilized and appropriated the shepherd image in the ANE. The major weakness of the work was his conviction that shepherds as a class were looked down upon or despised, based on material from the *Mishnah* and other late Jewish sources. While this perspective persists, in some circles the idea is understood to be fallacious. However, in light of the influence of *TDNT* over the last half century and its continued widespread use, this idea will likely continue to be perpetuated.

1.2 Wilfred Tooley[53]

Tooley is less wide ranging than Jeremias and focuses on the shepherd/sheep image in the synoptic gospels, principally Mark and Matthew. The article is a response to the three points made by Jeremias in the *TDNT* article reviewed above in which Tooley wants to examine how 'firmly embedded this image is in Jesus' teaching and in what categories it was used'.[54] He takes issue with Jeremias' three synoptic categories cited above and examines each of the occurrences separately, along with their parallels. He begins with the two occurrences in Mark and their parallels in Matthew (Mk 6:34//Mt 9:36 and Mk 14:27-28//Mt 26:31).

---

[52] Jeremias *TDNT* 6:493.
[53] Tooley (1964) 15-25.
[54] Tooley (1964) 15.

He argues that the context of the first use in Mark 6:34//Mattew 9:36 would appear to be different in each of the Gospels but then appeals for the common theme of 'teaching' in both.[55] He notes references to teaching in Mark 6:30 and Matthew 9:35 and also notes that both texts are in the context of the choosing and sending out of the twelve. (Note the sending of the twelve in Mk 6:6b-13 and the continuation of the theme in 6:30-34 after a long interlude concerning John the Baptist in Mk 6:14-29; Cf. Mt 10). Tooley's conclusion that Matthew is dependent upon Mark is incorporated into the argument of Chapter 8 of this thesis. The teaching context seems valid enough but Tooley does nothing with the shepherd image itself. By default one is left with the impression that because the context is one of teaching the shepherd image is at best marginalized. Also, Tooley does nothing regarding any possible intertextual connections with the biblical tradition concerning the phrase 'sheep without a shepherd'. The metaphor itself is not dealt with nor is it related to the biblical tradition from which it comes.

Tooley then continues his review of Mark 14:27-28//Matthew 26:31. Tooley questions whether these verses are *verba Christi.* He concludes that since it is the only Synoptic reference where Jesus uses the shepherd image of his death (and death of a shepherd is not to be found in the OT), Jesus surely did not use the shepherd metaphor to speak of his own death. The nearest thing in the OT to the death of a shepherd is Isaiah 53:6, which he discounts because from his perspective the only connection 'is the pastoral image'.[56] The problem here is that he does not address the points made by Jeremias concerning the relationship between the 'smiting' of Zechariah 13:7 and

[55] Tooley (1964) 15-16.
[56] Tooley (1964)

Isaiah 53:6[57] where 'the Lord has laid on him the iniquity of us all'. Further, he states that because of the political overtones of the image in the OT and in Zechariah especially, this is inconsistent with the passion story. And, because Jesus wanted to avoid political misinterpretation Mk 14:27-28 cannot be a saying of Jesus. Finally, he concludes the Zechariah quote probably originates in the early church's search for *testimonia* in regard to his death and resurrection.[58] The major contention I have with Tooley on these three points is that he simply asserts these statements and does nothing to argue positively for them or argue against the points made by Jeremias. There is minimal critical examination of the texts themselves. Often his reasoning is based on a conclusion that assumes that Jesus would or would not do something based on some overarching theological theme (in this case, the avoidance of being misunderstood as a political messiah). Or, he assumes that a certain portion of the text is the perspective of the early church and therefore could not have originated with Jesus. It may be that one takes exception to the interpretation of the texts by Jeremias but to reject it without dealing with the texts directly in an alternative fashion is not helpful. Therefore, Tooley's dismissal of Mark 14:27-28//Matthew 26:31 as a key text for the shepherd motif is unfounded.

When Tooley turns to Matthew he identifies 'six "shepherd texts", including two that have parallels in Mark (Mk 6:34//Mt 9:36 and Mk 14:27-28//Mt 26:31), which we have dealt with, and four others (Mt 7:15; Mt 10:6//15:24; Mt 10:16//Lk 10:3).'[59] Surprisingly, for whatever reason, he omits and never discusses Matthew 2:6. Tooley deals with the four additional Matthean texts briefly: 1) For Matthew 7, he

---

[57] Jeremias *TDNT* 6:493.
[58] Tooley (1964) 19.
[59] Tooley (1964) 19-20.

concludes 'the reference to the shepherd is heavily veiled if present at all'.[60] 2) Matthew 10:5-6 is a saying of Jesus but Matthew 15:24 is dependent upon it and is secondary.[61] 3) In Matthew 10:16//Lk 10:3, the two shepherd parables are of little help in establishing the shepherd motif because the first is from Matthew 18:12-14//Lk 15:3-7 and is in the context of the early church. If it originated with Jesus the original *Sitz im Leben* is lost. Yet, the parable does suggest that Jesus uses 'the image to describe the love of God'.[62] Tooley maintains that since Matthew 25:31ff is Jewish apocalyptic 'it would therefore be most unwise to use the passage as an example of Jesus' use of the shepherd image'.[63]

Tooley concludes the article by asserting that in light of his argument the shepherd metaphor is not as 'strongly embedded' in the synoptic tradition as is often asserted. In response to Jeremias' three categories, only one of the three may be authenticated, namely the mission of Jesus. Tooley concedes that Jesus probably did call 'new shepherds to feed God's people' in Matthew 10:5-6 (possibly also in Lk 12:32) and so implicitly reveals the neglect of the current Jewish leadership.[64] Besides simply discounting certain shepherd texts, Tooley offers three main arguments against the shepherd image. First, shepherds were despised in society, so Jesus would have been reluctant to use the image.[65] As noted in the critique of Jeremias, there is no longer the willingness to view shepherds in the first century on the basis of late rabbinic materials. Secondly, Tooley asserts that the image of a shepherd dying plays no significant role in the OT or any other relevant literature so it is unlikely that Jesus

---

[60] Tooley (1964) 20.
[61] Tooley (1964) 20-21.
[62] Tooley (1964) 23.
[63] Tooley (1965) 22.
[64] Tooley (1964) 24.
[65] Tooley (1964) 23.

used the shepherd image to describe his own death.[66] The problem here, as is elsewhere in the article, Tooley never truly argues anything, he simply asserts that because there is little evidence then it does not matter. The reality is that Zechariah 13:7 and Isaiah 53:6 were texts that exercised considerable influence in the early church. In addition, there are other arguments that have led many scholars to believe that Jesus did relate to and identify himself with these passages. This will be explored more fully when Matthew 26:31 is considered in Chapter Seven. Third, Tooley argues that because the shepherd metaphor had military and political overtones that Jesus would have used it only marginally. This, it seems, does not take seriously enough the shepherd-messiah texts in the exilic and post-exilic prophets (e.g. Jer 23:1-8; Ez 34:23-24, 37:24-25) and the role they play in Matthew. I will argue this in Chapter Seven when the shepherd texts are analyzed. And as 'unwise' as it may be, according to Tooley, this thesis will include Matthew 25:31ff among the shepherd texts to be considered.

1.3 Francis Martin[67]

Of primary interest in Martin's article is his consideration of issues related to Matthew's use of intertextual techniques which leads him to deal with a theory of metaphor. While he uses his own language, not the current idiom, for discussing the use of 'theme' or 'image' (metaphor), 'literary heritage' and 'image context' (intertextuality),[68] he comes close to giving a definition of metaphor when he says,

> There are many ways in which a theme or image may be evoked. An image may become the vehicle by which two themes interpenetrate and mutually modify one another.[69]

---

[66] Tooley (1964).
[67] Martin (1975) 261-301.
[68] Martin (1975) 265.
[69] Martin (1975) 264.

In Chapter Three, I consider some of the basic theories of metaphor and how they come to bear upon the shepherd/sheep motif. Martin anticipates the need to understand the idea and function of 'image,' even if he only does this in a brief manner. His language of 'interpenetrate and mutually modify' sounds similar to the language of I.A. Richards whom he alludes to, but does not reference.[70] Martin's comments are brief but they reveal his awareness of several implications: 1) The need to recognize that in a discussion of 'image' there is some kind of interactive dimension.[71] 2) An image must be shared by common human experience in order to have meaning.[72] 3) That an image has the possibility of creating new insight. In relation to the shepherd image in Matthew specifically Martin puts it this way,

> Mtr's use of the image of shepherd is an instance of the interaction and interpenetration of various facets of an image that had already begun to coalesce in the successive uses of that image in the tradition which preceded the writing of the gospel.[73]

His terminology may need refinement according to current theories of metaphor and some theorists, as we see in Chapter Three, would take issue with his *interactionist* approach. But his sensitivities to the issues surely point the way forward.

Martin explores the shepherd metaphor from both Matthew's use of the OT and Matthew's 'interior allusion'.[74] His discussion of these interior allusions reveals an awareness of some of the Matthean literary dimensions. These are not unique from contemporary literary perspectives but in light of his primary focus on a historical-critical approach, it reveals literary sensitivity.[75]

---

[70] Martin (1975) 265. Richards (1936) and the theories of metaphor will be discussed in chapter 3.
[71] Martin (1975) 264.
[72] Martin (1975) 264.
[73] Martin (1975) 270.
[74] Martin (1975) 269-270.
[75] For the text forms he follows Gundry (1967) and Rothfuchs (1969).

Martin does not restrict himself to the direct quotes, but also includes allusions and so considers a wide range of Matthean texts: Mt 2:6, 9:36, 10:6, 12:9-14, 12:22-30, 14:14, 15:21-28, 18:12-14, 20:29-34, 21:1-12, 24:30, 25:32, 26:15, 26:31, 26:56, 27:3-10. Some of these texts will be dealt with in Chapter Seven. However, I have limited my focus to only those shepherd texts that directly allude to Jesus as shepherd.

Overall Martin's article is helpful and contributes to an understanding of the shepherd metaphor. There may be disagreements in detail concerning an exegetical choice or final way of looking at a specific text. Yet, his historical-critical approach rooted in seriously considering Matthew's sources along with his literary awareness makes his work an important contribution.

1.4 John Paul Heil[76]

Heil specifically distinguishes his treatment from that by Martin. Martin analyzed a number of indirect references to the image but Heil identifies eight passages that deal directly with the shepherd and sheep metaphor in Matthew.[77] Different, too, from Martin is his lack of a theory of metaphor; he makes no comment about metaphor or how he understands it, but simply assumes it.

A strength of Heil's argument is his appeal for a narrative strategy in approaching the passages, believing they build and reach a kind of climax in the passion narrative (26:31-32).[78] In Chapters 2 and 7, I will argue in continuity with Heil's narrative strategy on the basis of Matthew's literary and intertextual

[76] Heil (1993) 698-708.
[77] Heil (1993) 699, n 3. He briefly analyzes Mt 2:6, 9:36, 10:6 and 16, Mt 14:14, 15:24 and 32, Mt 18:12-14, 25:31-46 and 26:31-32.
[78] Heil (1993) 698.

techniques.[79] Matthew not only uses the biblical tradition intertextually, but uses it intratextually by relating themes and motifs to one another within the Gospel.

Heil proposes 'that Ezekiel 34 in particular contains the entire semantic field needed for the implied reader to appreciate fully the Matthean shepherd metaphor'.[80] This approach is too narrow, especially when we take into account Matthew's use of the broader biblical tradition. In light of the fact that Matthew explicitly quotes the OT over sixty times and alludes to it nearly three hundred times, it would seem that the 'implied author presupposes' that the 'implied reader' knows far more of the biblical tradition than just Ezekiel 34.[81] In all fairness he acknowledges this 'rich tradition of the Jewish Scriptures', recognizing the explicit quotes in Matthew 2:6 and 26:31 but in both cases he appeals for an Ezekiel 34 background. Yet, even with these minimal concessions asserted by Heil, his main concern is to show the connections between Ezekiel 34 and Matthew's use of the shepherd/sheep metaphor. Heil's ostensive neglect of the broader biblical tradition has allowed him to keep a sustained focus on Ezekiel 34, which substantially contributes to our understanding of the shepherd and sheep metaphor.

1.5 Nicholas Cachia[82]

In a substantial study Cachia examines the image of the Good Shepherd with the ultimate goal of using the image as a resource for spiritual leadership in regard to the ministerial priesthood. Cachia's main emphasis is on John's Gospel. However,

---

[79] These literary techniques will be considered in chapters 2 and 7 below. E.g. how Matthew emphasizes the presence of Christ throughout the Gospel in 1:23, 18:20 and 28:20.
[80] Heil (1993) 699.
[81] Heil (1993) 699, n 3. Matthew's use of the biblical tradition is considered in chapter 2 and applied in chapter 7.
[82] Cachia (1997).

before he addresses the Gospel in chapter two, he turns his attention first to a discussion on *image*[83] and then a survey of the shepherd motif in the ANE, the biblical tradition, Jewish tradition and the NT.[84] The heart of the study focuses on the image in John with the final two chapters considering the image in the early church and how it may be applied to the ministerial priesthood. His discussion on *image* is the primary focus for review here.

Cachia first considers what he calls the basic principles at work in the use of symbol, image, metaphor and meaning in his introduction.[85] Following Tracy, he begins by discussing the different meanings of *meaning*.[86] Throughout his discussion he uses *image, symbol* and *metaphor* interchangeably. This can be problematic. As I argue in Chapter Three, following Soskice, *metaphor* and *image* may be used interchangeably but, *symbol* should be 'distinguished from metaphor as a category which includes the non-linguistic; e.g. the cross is a symbol for Christianity'.[87] In addition while *image* is often used to designate mental events and visual representations, in this thesis *image* will be used as a generic term for figures of speech associated with metaphor.

Using symbol and metaphor synonymously, Cachia explains the methodological presuppositions necessary for his understanding of the significance of analogical (imagistic) language in theology with four assertions:

First, images have their own original contexts and continue to change; they are not static, but dynamic.[88] In this consideration he reminds us that symbols/metaphors

---

[83] Approx. 25 pages.
[84] Approx. 85 pages.
[85] He bases his studies primarily on Van Roo (1992), Rahner (1975), Lonergan (1990), Tracy (1970, 1981), McFague (1982), Dulles (1995).
[86] Tracy (1970) 213-217 and (1981).
[87] Soskice (1985) 55.
[88] Cachia (1997) 15.

develop and may be affected by other cultures. Therefore a symbol/metaphor can change from a positive one in a given context and become negative or irrelevant in another because they become out of date.[89] This observation is in keeping with his primarily diachronic approach to the shepherd/sheep metaphor. His observation supports my thesis in that diachronic change occurs with the shepherd metaphor and I will attempt throughout the thesis to note when and how this occurs.

Second, the capacity for the symbol/image to be understood assumes a shared perception by the perceiver with the metaphor that is being used.[90] Here he also emphasizes that a symbol/metaphor may express more than the understanding can conceive or grasp. Therefore, 'metaphors aim to call forth feelings and attitudes as well as to shape perception and interpretation. They are emotional, evaluative, and cognitive, all at the same time'.[91] This, he notes, is why a symbol or image may be perceived by different people in different ways. His fundamental point here is a methodological one because in order to understand a symbol or image one must appreciate the context which gave rise to it and the context in which the image is perceived and appropriated.

A third characteristic is that because the metaphor speaks about something that is not the thing itself it also has limitations.[92] By this he is considering the limitations of any given metaphor. In Chapter Three I basically agree with these three observations even though I arrive at them in a very different way than Cachia has.

---

[89] Cachia (1997) 15.
[90] Cachia (1997) 15.
[91] Cachia (1997) 16.
[92] Cachia (1997) 17.

His final claim is that the same image may be the symbol of more than one reality. 'All symbols are polyvalent'.[93] If by this he means that what is said by way of metaphor is unique and cannot be said in any other way and that the parts of the metaphor create new meanings, then I agree. Yet, it is here that I take issue with using symbol as a synonym for metaphor and image. This will be examined in detail in Chapter Three.

His position in 'Images in Theology' is similar to my argument in Chapter Three that metaphor is essential in religion and for talking about God. After a discussion of the limitations of symbol and then following A. Dulles,[94] he emphasizes that mostly, 'although not exclusively,' biblical metaphors are 'personal, relational images'.[95] God as shepherd is one of those images. The point is primarily to emphasize that since symbols or images are human expressions to describe God 'they are normally not a word on God in himself but on our relationship with him'.[96]

At this point he introduces, rightly, the caution that any time one image is being considered, it must be kept in mind that it is only an 'angular interpretation' of the Christ story.[97] This is of course true and a good reminder. He also footnotes approvingly McFague's observation, 'A metaphorical theology will insist that *many* metaphors and models are necessary, that a piling up of images is essential, both to avoid idolatry and to attempt to express the richness and variety of the divine-human relationship'.[98] With this caution and the recognition that imagistic language will have many interpretations, Cachia sets out three criteria he will follow: 'a) the biblical texts

---

[93] Cachia (1997) 17.
[94] Dulles (1995) 19.
[95] Cachia (1997) 19.
[96] Cachia (1997) 19.
[97] 'angular interpretation' is Dulles' phrase (1995) 19.
[98] Cachia (1997) 20, n 49, quoting McFague (1982) 19

which make use of the image are to be carefully and adequately studied; b) the memory of Jesus Christ is allowed to function in its critical and corrective role; c) the full Christian tradition, especially the patristic one, is allowed to work its corrective and expansive functions'.[99] Our approach focuses on the first point. This thesis will offer a careful study of the biblical texts (in particular in the Gospel Matthew) that make use of the image.

1.6 Jonathan David Huntzinger[100]

In an unpublished doctoral thesis, Huntzinger studies the shepherd/sheep metaphor in the exilic and post-exilic prophetic and Synoptic Gospel literature. He opens with a discussion about metaphor and speech about God and after a brief introduction on metaphor he identifies his perspective on metaphor and his method (after the brief introduction he discusses definition, theory and meaning in Chapter 1, pp 23-54).

Huntzinger identifies I.A. Richards and Janet Martin Soskice's *interanimation* theory of metaphor as representing his perspective.[101] The *interanimation* approach builds on and modifies the *interactionist* theories. The different approaches to the various theories of metaphor will be discussed in Chapter Three. Here we will only note some of the more important elements that Huntzinger identifies:[102] 1) Metaphors are linguistic exemplifications and say something that cannot be said in any other way. 2) The meaning of the metaphor is not in the word but the context of the complete utterance. 3) The meaning is the *interanimation* between *tenor* (tenor=subject) and its *vehicle* (vehicle=means by which the subject is described). 4) Metaphors are based

---

[99] Cachia (1997) 21; He notes that he has adapted this criteria, in part, from Tracy (1981) 372.
[100] Huntzinger (1999) 1-282.
[101] Huntzinger (1999) 20. I also follow Soskice (1985) in Chapter 3. I located the Huntzinger thesis after developing my perspective on metaphor.
[102] Huntzinger (1999) 35ff.

upon *models* that come from shared human experience. This theory of metaphor is part of his method and he assumes that shepherd/sheep metaphor was familiar and became a basic way that the biblical writers attempted to speak of God and understand their relationship with him.[103]

In his second chapter, Huntzinger looks at the background of the model that the shepherd/sheep metaphor is based upon. He limits his study to specific texts because of the extensive use of the metaphor and because he intends to develop a thematic study of the image as it relates to God rather than a full biblical theology. In Chapter Three he considers the metaphor in the exilic and post-exilic prophets. His focus is on Jeremiah 23; Ezekiel 20:33-38, 34:1-31; Isaiah 49:8-12 and Second Zechariah (Chapters 9-14). One aspect of his method throughout is to consider the literary context by examining the verbal vocabulary. To this end he says, 'The verbal vocabulary will define the behavior and activity of the shepherd in these passages and will describe, as a result, the nature of the relationship perceived to exist between God, his leaders, and his people'.[104] In Chapter Four he briefly reviews the intertestamental literature and then considers selected texts from the Synoptic Gospels. Specific to Matthew he examines: Matthew 9:35-10:16; 18:10-14; 25:31-46; and 26:30-35. Specific observations by Huntzinger will be considered throughout the thesis.

1.7 Timothy S. Laniak[105]

Laniak provides a full biblical theology of the shepherd/sheep metaphor. He traces the shepherd-leadership tradition through the OT and the NT, along with chapters on metaphor, the pastoral realities in the ANE and Israel and shepherd-rulers in the ancient word. Taking his title from Jeremiah 3:15, Laniak's thesis is that there is

[103] Huntzinger (1999) 1-3.
[104] Huntzinger (1999) 21.
[105] Laniak (2006).

a 'discernable pastoral "stream of tradition"' running through scripture from beginning to end.[106]

A strength of Laniak's study is the identification of two fundamental dimensions or traditions within this pastoral tradition.[107] The first of these is *YHWH* as shepherd→Moses as *YHWH's* under-shepherd→*YHWH* is protector, provider, and guide in relation to the exodus/wilderness/conquest tradition. The second of these is *YHWH* as shepherd→David as *YHWH's* under-shepherd→*YHWH* promises to send the royal Shepherd-Messiah motif. *YHWH* is the shepherd of Israel but Moses and David become prototypical leaders in the shepherd tradition. The prophets, especially the exilic and post-exilic prophets, develop both of these traditions creating a new hope and expectation of a second exodus and a righteous-royal Shepherd-Messiah. According to the Gospels and the rest of the NT, this is fulfilled in Jesus. At the same time, Laniak acknowledges that there is still the tradition in different parts of the NT that Christians are still understood to be in 'exile' until the end of history.[108]

Laniak makes the claim that Matthew understands Jesus to be the 'compassionate Davidic shepherd'.[109] This suggests a similar but slightly different emphasis than my focus that Matthew sees Jesus as the 'righteous, royal shepherd'. While one of Laniak's goals is to address the shepherd metaphor as it applies to biblical leadership, he does this through the use of historical-critical, linguistic and literary methods. Since the focus of Laniak's work significantly overlaps with my thesis, his specific research will be considered in this thesis.

---

[106] Laniak (2006) 24, n.3. He prefers the term 'tradition' because it can also emphasize a sense of history.
[107] Laniak (2006) 24-25.
[108] Laniak (2006) 25. E.g. I Peter and Revelation: 'Leaders are challenged to follow the divine Shepherd who became their sacrificial lamb'.
[109] Laniak (2006) 182-194; 'Matthew: the compassionate Davidic shepherd'.

CHAPTER 2
METHOD

2.1 Introduction

This chapter will address several issues, including (2.2) the relationship between Matthew's Jewish-Christian perspective and the emerging Judaism of his day, (2.3) Matthew's redaction and composition, (2.4) Matthew's use of sources and literary techniques and (2.4) Matthew's intertextual use of biblical tradition, typology and Shepherd texts.

2.2 Perspective regarding the Gospel

This thesis assumes that Matthew's Gospel was written by a Jew to Jews who had come to believe in Jesus as the Messiah. This is the general consensus, based upon, for example, Matthew's interest in Jewish legal matters and Jesus' statement that he came to 'fulfill', not 'abolish the law'(5:17-18); Matthew's concern that Jesus' mission was to Israel (10:6-7; 15:24); his extensive use of the biblical traditions, especially his distinctive 'formula quotations' used to show that Jesus 'fulfilled' the words of the prophets (e.g. 1:22-23 etc.); his preference for the use of the phrase 'kingdom of heaven' rather than 'the kingdom of God'; and his explanation of the Jewish claims about what happened to the body of Jesus (28:11-15). These and other characteristics of the Gospel support this consensus.[1] Also the majority of scholars argue that Matthew is writing after the traumatic events of the fall of Jerusalem, sometime in the last quarter of the first century C.E.[2] He therefore writes at a time when formative Judaism is in its earliest stages. The Gospel responds in a number of

---

[1] Cf. J. P. Meier (1991) 17-25 and Meier (1992) 3:622-41who continues to argue Matthew was Gentile.
[2]Cf. Nolland (2005) 14-17, who contends for the 60s. He argues, along with other observations, that because of the lack of a 'heightened Jewish nationalism, Matthew is to be dated before the beginnings of the Jewish war'.

ways to that emerging situation. While there is consensus concerning the foregoing general assertions, there is less agreement concerning details.

2.2.1 Matthew's Jewish-Christian Setting

A major topic of discussion in Matthean research has been to understand the relationship/conflict between Matthew's Jewish-Christian stance and the emerging Judaism of his day. To state the differing questions: Was the conflict represented in the Gospel between the Jewish-Christian community/communities and Judaism? Or, was the conflict between two Jewish groups, a Judaism that did not recognize Jesus as Messiah over against a Christian Judaism holding that Jesus was Messiah?

On the one hand, some scholars hold that Matthew's Jewish-Christian community/communities, consisting mainly of Jews, have parted with Judaism. These Jewish-Christian group(s) may also be in the process of beginning to include Gentiles.[3] Concerning the details of how this relationship is understood are varying descriptions of how these Jewish-Christians are relating to their non-believing Jewish brothers and sisters.[4] With this view the Gospel can be understood, 'at least in part, as an apology—a defense of Christianity over against non-Christian Judaism'.[5]

On the other hand, some scholars are more radical than others.[6] They take the position that the Matthean community is still part of Judaism[7]. As a result, scholars of this type reject the notion of a Jewish-Christian community and propose to view

---

[3] E.g. Stanton (1992) 124-131, 139-42, 151-152, 156-168, cf. also (1995). Also holding this position are Garland (1979) & (2001); Hare (1967) & (2000); Luz (1989); Senior (1999); and Strecker (1966).
[4] So e.g. Luz 1:88-89, who states, 'The Matthean community, whose mission in Israel had come to an end, no longer belongs to the Jewish synagogue system. The fissure between community and synagogue is final. Any attempt to situate the Matthean community within the Jewish synagogue system must be considered a failure...There is no hint of discussions held between the community and the synagogue'.
[5] Stanton (1992) 124.
[6] So e.g. Sim (1995) 39, argues that Matthew's 'community was critical of the surrounding Gentile society and adopted a policy of avoiding and shunning it'. Also, his more extensive discussion that the Gospel is anti-Gentile in (1998) 236-47.
[7] So Deutsch (1966); Harrington (1991); Overman (1990) & (1996); Saldarni (1992a) & (1994) and Sim (1995), (1998) & (2003).

Matthew's communities as a form of Christian-Judaism, one sect among many in first century Judaism.[8]

When the two extreme approaches are set side by side, as illustrated in Luz and Sim, it seems to be an either/or choice. After all, one position claims there is no cordial relationship between the Matthean communities and 'the synagogue'[9] and the other position says there is no inclusion of Gentiles.[10] Is there a way out of this cul-de-sac? The way out requires a mediating perspective.

The first approach is represented by Davies and Allison[11] who are inclined 'to believe that despite its positive association with Gentile Christians, Matthew's community was still a deviant Jewish association',[12] but also had 'differentiated' itself from the larger Jewish community in a number of ways.[13] It is this 'differentiation' that marks the Matthean community and gives it a unique position in regard to the larger Jewish community. This approach is supported first by Matthew's consistent use of 'their synagogues' (e.g. 4:23; 9:35; 10:17; 13:54) and 'your synagogues' in 23:34. Second, it is supported by his negative view of the Jewish leadership (e.g. the polemic of Chapter 23). Matthew will contrast Jesus as the righteous/royal shepherd sent to the 'lost sheep of the house of Israel' with this crisis in Jewish leadership. This is also supported by his disparaging comments concerning the term 'rabbi' (23:8 and 26:25, 49) used by Judas. The scribes are deemed inferior to Jesus who had unique authority in comparison to 'their scribes' (7:29). Matthew's most important concern is

---

[8] Sim (1998, 2003).
[9] So Luz (1989).
[10] So Sim (1998).
[11] Davies and Allison 3:692-704.
[12] Davies and Allison 3: 695. They also hold that 'Matthew's community still followed the Mosaic law, [therefore] they could not but have thought of themselves as Jews and have been thought Jews by others'.
[13] Davies and Allison 3:695-696.

christological, the proclamation of who Jesus is and the exaltation of Jesus throughout the Gospel. If the community does continue to 'follow the Mosaic law', it will do so in light of Matthew's understanding of Jesus' interpretation and actualization of it.[14] Matthew and these Jewish-Christian communities are no longer *Torah* centered. The *Torah* was the historic center of Israel's identity, along with the Temple and its supporting symbols. But that center is now located in Jesus the Messiah, who is the fulfillment of Israel's hopes and who is to be the focus of faith and commitment.[15] This radical shift to the person of Jesus is what defines obedience to *Torah* because now Jesus is the authoritative interpreter of the law, even 'Torah incarnate, animate law',[16] with his unique authority as the Son of God, Messiah.[17]

D. A. Hagner deals with many of the same details, only from another position: Matthew's Jewish-Christian community had 'broken with their unbelieving brothers and sisters'. Hagner disagrees with the position that Matthew's community is a Christian form of Judaism.[18] First, he questions the centrality of law in Matthew and takes exception with Sim who states, 'The Mosaic law occupies a central place in the Gospel of Matthew'.[19] Hagner responds, 'On the contrary, it is Jesus the Messiah, not the law, who is at the center of Matthew...The unparalleled authority of Jesus is

---

[14] Davies and Allison 3:710. 'The substance of Matthew's faith was neither a dogmatic system nor a legal code but a human being, whose life was, in outline and in detail, uniquely significant and therefore demanding of record'.
[15] Davies and Allison 3:709. 'The distinctiveness of Matthew's thinking over against that of his non-Christian Jewish contemporaries was the acceptance of Jesus as the centre of his religion: it was around him as a person that his theological thinking revolved. The fact is crucial. For Matthew, revelation belonged supremely to one life, the life of the Son of God'.
[16] Davies and Allison 3:711.
[17] Snodgrass (1996) 126. 'Jesus is the authoritative interpreter of the law, but Matthew does not now suggest that we merely follow Rabbi Jesus. The law is no longer the center of gravity; Jesus is. The Son of God is the one to whom the scriptures point and who lives in conformity with God's will and law and who teaches others to do so as well'.
[18] Hagner (2004) 264. He dialogues with Overman and Saldarini but takes special exception with Sim.
[19] Sim (1998) 123. Hagner (2004) 267, n. 11, notes Sim's heading 'The Centrality of the Law'.

apparent wherever the meaning of the law is in question'.[20] He acknowledges that faithful obedience to the law in Matthew is consistent with and important in Jewish-Christianity, but it is no longer obedience to the law itself because the 'focus constantly shifts to Jesus'.[21] So, while Hagner argues firmly throughout against a Christian-Judaism, he comes very close to Davies and Allison at some points,[22] yet from the opposing position. In earlier comments Hagner says:

> The evangelist's community thus shared in two worlds, the Jewish and the Christian. Although the members of this community saw their Christianity as the true fulfillment of Judaism, they were also very conscious that they had broken with their unbelieving brothers and sisters. They were struggling to define and defend a Jewish Christianity to the Jews, on the one hand, and to realize their identity with Gentile Christians, on the other. This twofold challenge explains the basic tensions encountered in the Gospel.[23]

This thesis recognizes this tension and acknowledges that the polemic in the Gospel suggests some kind of ongoing conflict and debate. Also, if the Matthean community has not 'formally' separated from the synagogue at the time Matthew writes his Gospel, it appears that he understands such a separation is inevitable.[24] He argues throughout the Gospel that the shift of Israel's center has occurred and is now located in the person of Jesus—in his words and works and in his death and resurrection.

---

[20] Hagner (2004) 267.
[21] Hagner (2004) 268.
[22] See article on: Christology, Mission, the Gentiles, the Jews; 'The Break with the Synagogue' and the 'newness' of the Jewish-Christian community.
[23] Hagner 1:lxxi. The phrase 'they had broken with their unbelieving brothers and sisters' indicates his commitment in the direction of the first position but his tone in the overall discussion, 1:lxviii-lxxi, reflects a mediating position.
[24] Hagner (2004) 278. 'My argument is that for all its Jewishness, Matthew indicates in a variety of ways that its community of necessity has had to break with the synagogue. The new things that the community affirmed were so incompatible with Judaism's orientation that its members could not have remained within Judaism, even in its formative state with the wide tolerance of diversity'.

2.2.2 Matthew's Sources

Concerning Matthew's sources, this thesis assumes the 'two-source' theory. It is assumed that Matthew knows Mark's Gospel (and if not the canonical Mark, something close to it) and is willing to use it as one of his primary sources for his Gospel. The debate over the relationship of these two Gospels is beyond the scope of the thesis. However, it is worth noting there are good reasons for assuming Markan priority, including the following: Matthew seems to take over approximately ninety percent of Mark. Using this material, Matthew edits out 'unnecessary' words resulting in a more concise description of Mark's material. He almost always improves Mark's syntax and also improves his Greek at many points. Matthew includes many literary techniques as he redacts Mark, along with vocabulary that can be discerned as Matthean and becomes part of his redactional intentions. Matthew's redaction of Mark is consistent throughout and proves to be much easier to account for than if Mark were using Matthew. The overall sequence of Mark seems to shape both Matthew and Luke. However, whereas Luke departs from Mark's sequence, Matthew follows it. When Matthew departs from Mark, Luke follows it. Matthew and Luke never contradict Mark together. Matthew shapes the sequence of the first ten chapters according to his own purposes, but from 11:1 he follows the sequence of Mark closely to the end of his Gospel. Mark has his own style of straightforwardness, with vividness of detail and fast-paced emphasis on the activities and movements of Jesus. According to the 'two-source' theory, these and other reasons are basic to purporting Markan priority in the interrelationship between the Synoptic Gospels.

The Evangelist not only used Mark, but also edited earlier source materials (both oral and written). If Markan priority is assumed, then a second source is needed.

to account for material shared in common between Matthew and Luke. For example, a text related to the shepherd motif, Mt 9:37b-38, is verbally identical to Lk 10:2b. This common material is frequently referred to as Q. Whether Q was a written document or an oral tradition is debated, a discussion of which is beyond the scope of the thesis. This source in whatever form(s) it takes, helps explain the common material between Matthew and Luke.

Along with these two main sources, Matthew also has incorporated material that is unique to his Gospel alone. This in all likelihood is oral tradition and commonly referred to as M. Again, the relation of this material to Q, whether it is related to a larger tradition overlapping with Q or related to an Aramaic tradition that informs the Gospel is beyond the scope of the thesis. What is assumed by the thesis is that Mark is the primary source, along with Matthew's own use and application of Q and M. To quote F. C. Burkitt's famous phrase, 'Matthew is a fresh edition of Mark; revised, rearranged, and enriched with new material...'[25]

Matthew deals with his sources faithfully, but not slavishly. He exercises some literary creativity. But, 'on the whole, Matthew was a tradent, a man who edited a tradition. Like the *tannaim*, he was a "repeater"'.[26] As a 'redactor' he was 'an exegete and commentator' in regard to the OT, Mark, Q, and M.[27] The way in which Matthew deals with his sources is 'creative but not innovative: he is committed to the traditions at his disposal, but he endeavors to elucidate them for his own community'.[28] Matthew deals with his sources as an 'exegete' and 'insists that the words of Jesus are to be

[25] Quoted in Stanton (1992) 52.
[26] Davies and Allison 3:722.
[27] Davies and Allison 3:705.
[28] Stanton (1992) 344.

carefully treasured. They are elucidated by the evangelist so that they can be appropriated by his community and used in its proclamation (28:18-20)'.[29]

2.3 Procedure regarding the Gospel

This thesis utilizes a redaction and composition critical approach. As such, it is concerned with the literary techniques of Matthew's Gospel. As noted above, Matthew's redaction is often evident. This opens the possibilities of relating the text under consideration to other texts within the Gospel. It is assumed that Matthew uses his sources and his own material with a certain consistency. Even when there seems to be conflicting concerns, for example, with Jesus' mission for 'lost sheep of the house of Israel' and his commission to 'go into all the world', the assumption is, until proven otherwise, that Matthew's own perspective is reasonably consistent.[30] The thesis, while working from a redaction-critical and composition-critical perspective, recognizes the 'cautions' and critique of G. N. Stanton and others regarding redaction criticism.[31]

In addition, special attention is paid to Matthew's literary techniques and distinctive stylistic features:[32] 1) his repetition of favorite words, phrases, formulas and whole sentences; 2) his utilization of *inclusion* and *chiasmus*; 3) his use of framing, not just with formulas or the *inclusio*, but by making use of whole pericopes or narrative events in order to establish a theological theme; 4) his collecting together like material, for example, miracle stories, sayings of Jesus and parables; 5) his application of triads in various ways; 6) his drawing upon 'Matthean vocabulary' to cross reference to other passages in the Gospel by echoing similar themes through verbal allusion; and 7) his use

[29] Stanton (1992) 345.
[30] This specific issue is dealt with below.
[31] Stanton (1992) 23-53. Cf. Davies and Allison 1:115 n. 68. Talbert (1978) and more recently Dunn (2001) 84-145.
[32] See especially Davies and Allison 1:72-96; Luz 1:36-41, 52-73 and Nolland (2005) 23-29.

of literary techniques to create structural markers. These are only some of the ways Matthew displays his literary genius in the composition of his Gospel.

Finally, it is ultimately the concern of the thesis to understand Matthew's Gospel in the socio-historical setting of the original audience in order to come to an historical-contextual interpretation of the shepherd/sheep metaphor in Matthew.[33] Along with Stanton however,

> I take it for granted that their responses [the original audience] offer invaluable guidance to modern readers, but I do not accept that the meaning of a text for modern readers is *determined* either by the author's original intention or by the response of the original audience.[34] [his emphasis]

The understanding of the text will be accomplished through a socio-historical review of the shepherd/sheep metaphor in the Ancient Near East, the Greco-Roman world and the Jewish world of the biblical tradition and Second Temple Judaism down to the first century. This strategy is not a new one but it is the conviction of the thesis that 'there are no grounds for abandoning a method which has been very fruitful'.[35] We will begin with Matthew's use of the biblical tradition.

2.4 Matthew's use of Biblical Tradition, Intertextuality and the Shepherd Texts

In this review of how Matthew has used the biblical tradition in his Gospel, we will include questions concerning the exegetical presuppositions of the early church and how these presuppositions relate to Matthew's use of the biblical tradition. Also included is a discussion of the criteria used for distinguishing between quotations and allusions in regard to Matthean intertextuality. Finally, this section concludes with a definition of typology in light of Matthew's use of scriptural motifs.

---

[33] Again Stanton (1992) 54-74.
[34] Stanton (1992) 72.
[35] Stanton (1992) 51.

2.4.1 Matthew's Use of the Biblical Tradition[36]

In order to appreciate Matthew's perspective of Jesus as Messiah and specifically his use of the shepherd motif in regard to Jesus, it is important to understand his use of the OT. Matthew's use of the biblical tradition has been a primary area of Matthean research in recent scholarship. Matthew uses some sixty-one quotes from the biblical tradition in his Gospel. According to NA 27th edition, forty of these are explicit citations and twenty-one are direct quotations but without explicit citation. When the allusions (which approach nearly 300) are taken into account, it becomes evident that Matthew's use of the OT is important in understanding his use of the shepherd metaphor.[37]

2.4.1.1 A Review of research of Matthew's use of the OT

Until recently, when scholars focused on Matthew's use of the scriptural tradition it was limited to the formula quotations.[38] The formula quotations reflect one more way Matthew establishes his own theological concern in regard to Christology. The evangelist has a christological agenda, and it is expressed in his formula quotations, namely that Jesus is the Son of God and the one who fulfills Israel's Scriptures. The fulfillment in Jesus testifies to the authenticity of Matthew's claims about Jesus. Scholars generally agree that Matthew uses the biblical material--whether

---

[36] Ellis (1991) 53-74, Evans (2004) 130-145; Hübner (1992) 1096-1104; Penner (1999) 540-543; Moyise (2000) 14-41; (2001) 1-20; Knowles (2006) 59-82 and Wold (2005) 43-79.

[37] Senior (1997) 89. 'The exact statistics will differ among scholars, e.g. Davies and Allison 1:29-58, 3:573-577.

[38] Stanton (1992) 346. 'They [the formula quotations] have dominated discussion of Matthew's use of the OT and have frequently been appealed to in attempts to elucidate the origin and purpose of the gospel'. This was generally the case, an exception being Gundry (1967). Mt's general use of the OT, not just the formula quotations, has received more attention in recent scholarship; for example, the very helpful and detailed discussion in Davis and Allison 1:29-58. They identify, classify and discuss between 290-300 OT quotes and allusions in Matthew. Their results led them to the implied conclusion that Matthew was Jewish, that he knew and used the Hebrew Scriptures, as well as the Greek LXX. Also, that he does not limit his use to only the LXX, apart from the formula quotes, but uses Hebrew sources even outside the formula quotations.

formula quotations, implicit citations, or allusions--to underscore and emphasize his Christology which is intent on highlighting Jesus' messianic authority and uniqueness in the context of formative Judaism.

The 'formula quotations' refer to ten explicit quotations (some argue for as many as fourteen[39]) given by Matthew and introduced by some version of the redactional formula: ἵνα (ὅπως) πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος· (in order [so that] to fulfill what had been spoken by the Lord through the prophet). The ten texts identified are: 1:22-23, 2:15, 2:17-18, 2:23, 4:14-16, 8:17, 12:17-21, 13:35, 21:4-5, 27:9-10.[40] Texts also considered are 2:6, 3:3, 26:54 and 56. But, as we shall see, the last four do not meet the criteria of the previous ten. The formula quotations are also referred to as 'reflection quotations' (*Reflexionszitate* is meant to point to redaction and *Kontextzitate* is meant to emphasize that the quote is part of the narrative) and 'fulfillment/formula quotations' (*Erfullungsformel*).[41] The discussion has tended to be split concerning whether the source of the formula quotations: 1) comes to Matthew as tradition (a source that he uses) or 2) are Matthew's own redaction. Recently, because of the influence of Stendahl[42] and

---

[39] E.g. Brown (1994) 648. In Brown (1977) 98 he notes 4 citations (2:5b-6; 3:3; 13:14-15; 26:56) are in question because 'Imperfections in the formula create uncertainty as to whether this passage should be classified as a formula citation'.

[40] Davies and Allison 3:574. They break down the formula quotations as follows: '1.22-3: general agreement with LXX, Isa 7.14 [vol 1:213-214]; 2.15: non-LXX translation of MT, Hos 11.1 [vol 1:262]; 2.17-18: citation of Jer 31.15 closer to MT that LXX but influence from the latter is possible [vol 1:267-270]; 2.23: non-LXX translation of MT, Isa 4.3 modified by a wordplay involving *nazir* [vol 1:275-281]; 4.14-16: translation of MT, Isa 9.1-2 with LXX influence [vol 1:379-386]; 8.17: non-LXX translation of MT, Isa 53.4 [vol 2:37-38]; 12.17-21: translation of MT, Isa 42.1-4,9 with influence from the LXX and contact with targum, OT Peshitta, and Theodotion [vol 2:323-327]; 13.35: citation of Ps 78.2; the first six words = LXX, the rest render the MT [vol 2:425-426]; 21.5: conflation of LXX, Isa 62.11 + LXX Zech 9.9 + MT Zech 9.9 [vol 3:118-121]; 27.9-10: loose rendering of MT, Zech 11.13 with LXX influence; the quotation is prefaced with 'Jeremiah' and is to be read in the light of Jeremiah 18-19 and 32 [vol 3:567-571].'

[41] Cf. Rothfuchs (1969) 27ff. He uses the expression 'fulfillment quotations' (*Erfullungsformel*) in an attempt to emphasize the most important point of Matthew himself, πληρόω.

[42] Stendahl (1968).

Strecker[43] the tendency is to argue that Matthew drew from traditional materials. Luz follows and states that 'formula quotations come from pre-Matthean Christian tradition'.[44]

Stendahl argued that the formula quotations were the product of a Matthean 'school' and different from the other OT citations which reflect a Septuagintal form. The argument insists formula quotations reflect a Matthean 'school' which had its own unique way of interpreting and adapting the biblical materials in regard to Jesus. Using the Dead Sea Scrolls, Stendahl argued that the Matthean school used an approach that was originally not unlike the *pesher* technique of the Qumran community in regard to their understanding of the Teacher of Righteousness as interpreted according to the book of Habakkuk. However, more recently, Stendahl qualified his thesis that the mixed text form of the formula quotations is a unique creation of Matthew's 'school'. He also acknowledged the fluidity of both the Greek and Hebrew texts.[45] Neither his appeal for a 'school' nor for the *Pesher* technique as an explanation for the formula quotations have received overwhelming scholarly support. What has received wider acceptance is his appeal for a 'mixed' text in the formula quotations. Stendahl argued that while the formula quotations were mixed in character, Matthew used them substantially as he received them. He asserts this on the basis of Matthew's tendency not to significantly alter Mark or Q. Stendahl also argued that Matthew's Bible quotations outside the formula quotes were from the LXX. Stendahl's arguments in

---

[43] Strecker (1966).
[44] Luz 1:160.
[45] Stendahl (1968) iv-v. 'It strengthens the suggestion that Hebrew texts continued to cause revision of Greek texts. And we are increasingly informed that the O.T. text—Greek and Hebrew—was not yet standardized. In manuscripts like 1QIs[a] we have examples of alternative readings given in the manuscript itself'.

regard to the formula quotations gained general acceptance, but his arguments concerning Matthew's use of the LXX were questioned.

Rather than Stendahl's Matthean 'school', Strecker built the case that Matthew had 'a collection of prophecies, which had reached Matthew in written form' (along with Mk and Q) that was not unlike the *testimonia* found at Qumran.[46] Arguing earlier along similar lines, but taking issue with the work of both Stendahl and Strecker, was Gärtner. On the basis of his work with Habakkuk from Qumran, he argued that Matthew's quotations were derived from the missionary preaching of the early church.[47] Luz continued this position, arguing that because Matthew was careful to change very little in Mark and Q, he would not have changed his source regarding the formula quotations.[48] Yet he does agree with the emerging consensus that both Mark and Q follow the LXX, and that the Matthew formula quotations are mixed and not derived solely from the LXX. Matthew is faithful to reproduce the quotations as he substantially receives them: 'the conservative evangelist did not want radically to alter their wording'.[49]

At the same time, the opposite position has also continued to find defenders.[50] These defenders have appealed for Matthean redaction rather than some traditional source. Or, if Matthew has received the tradition, he shapes it so that it reflects his

---

[46] Strecker (1966) 83. Cf.Vermes (1997) 495.
[47] Gärtner (1954).
[48] Luz 1:156-164.
[49] Luz 1:157-161. Luz says: 'Once again we see the evangelist as a conservative tradent and interpreter who is obligated to the tradition. He treated the wording of the quotation available to him with the same care as he treated the text of the Gospel of Mark or of Q'.
[50] For our purposes they are Gundry (1967), Rothfuchs (1969), McConnell (1969), Soares Prabhu (1976), Brown (1977, updated 1988), Stanton (1992), and Davies and Allison (1988, 1997).

own theological perspective.[51] Even earlier, prior to these, W. D. Davies had taken issue with Stendahl.[52] Davies argued that Matthew was closer to his Hebrew roots than most were willing to give him credit. Stendahl continued to disagree and replied, 'But the influence of Palestinian Judaism on the Gospel of Matthew can hardly be as direct as Davies' study presupposes. Matthew's principal sources were in Greek, with primarily Greek traditions: Mark, Q, and others'.[53] Along with Davies, Gundry furthered the argument through a re-examination of the OT quotations in Matthew by including allusive quotations along with the formula quotations. He defended his thesis based on the fact that the Dead Sea Scrolls indicated that allusive quotation of the OT was a conscious literary practice.[54]

Gundry challenged Stendahl's approach and noted that only when Matthew is following Mark or Q does he stay very close to the LXX wording.[55] 'The really big fault in Stendahl's treatment of the Matthaean [sic] quotations is that he does not take seriously non-Septuagintal quotations outside the formula-quotations... The overwhelmingly mixed text-form in all groups of synoptic quotations, demolishes the very foundation of the school-hypothesis, viz., the distinctiveness of the formula-citations.'[56] He came to the conclusion that 'although Stendahl's discussion of the text-form in the Matthaean [sic] quotations is often admirable, we must write *non*

[51] The positions have been rather 'either/or,' 'all or nothing' with little appeal for the possibility that some of the quotations come from pre-Matthean tradition and others originating from Matthew and are his attempt to add to the existing tradition through reflection on and application of the biblical tradition.
[52] Davies (1964) 208ff.
[53] Stendahl (1968) xii.
[54] Gundry (1967).
[55] Gundry (1967) 155-159.
[56] Gundry (1967) 157-158.

sequitur over his thesis as a whole'.[57] That is, Gundry disagrees that there was a Matthean 'school' as Stendahl had proposed.

Gundry claimed that the allusions to the OT in Matthew should also be examined because they were of a mixed form. He contended that all other non-Markan quotations should be examined. Gundry was criticized at this point because of the difficulty of determining text type from the allusions, which were often only a few words or phrases. He also argued for a *targumic* approach to the various forms of the Hebrew text in circulation rather than the *pesher* technique of the Qumran community.[58] In fact, Gundry became known for the phrase: 'Matthew was a *targumist*'.[59] Although Gundry's work was not appreciated at the time, more recently scholars, such as Stanton, have built on it.

Strecker argued that the formula quotations derived from a source somewhat like the *testimonia* found at Qumran. On this basis, he claimed that the formula citations were of secondary importance for the theology of the Gospel. This argument was supported, for example, on the observation that the formula quotations were not crucial to the narrative of the Gospel, especially in the infancy narratives. Both Rothfuchs and McConnell argue against Strecker concerning the theological contributions of the quotations,[60] though with varying degrees of disagreement. Contrary to Strecker, both Rothfuchs and McConnell say that the formula quotations and Matthew's use of the OT generally supported Matthew's theological tendencies.

---

[57] Gundry (1967) 159.
[58] Gundry (1967) 172-174.
[59] Gundry (1967) 172. 'Mt was his own targumist and drew on a knowledge of the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek textual traditions of the OT'.
[60] So e.g. Davies and Allison 1:191 'As most scholars now recognize, the redactor has added the five so-called 'formula quotations'. 1.22-3; 2.5b-6, 15b-c, 17-18, and 23b are 'parasitic'. [Quoting Soares Prabhu, passim.]...They [the narratives] run as smoothly or even more smoothly without them. When one adds that the formula quotations are in harmony with Matthew's special interests, no doubt about their derivation should remain'.

Rothfuchs argued for a traditional source but strongly emphasized that Matthew himself was responsible for the material in both its language[61] and its Christological emphasis.[62] Working on the infancy narrative in Matthew, both G. M. Soares Prabhu[63] and R. Brown[64] contend for Matthean redaction and the mixed nature and fluidity of the Hebrew and Greek in the textual tradition. More recently, G. N. Stanton[65] and Davies and Allison[66] re-examine Matthew's use of the OT beyond the formula quotations.

Stanton emphasizes the contribution of Gundry's work and challenged the prevailing opinions of Stendahl, Strecker and Luz. He argued for the redactional nature of Matthew's use of the quotations, rather than of some traditional source. He claimed, as others had done, that Matthew follows his sources rather than the LXX alone: 'Matthew's primary allegiance is to the textual form of the quotations in his sources rather than to the LXX as such'.[67] Stanton argument included: 1) The original source of Matthew's redactional activity could have been inspired by the last part of Mark 14:49. 2) Matthew shapes his quotations to fit the surrounding narrative context. 3) 'There is no obvious answer' to why the quotations are distributed the way they are.

---

[61] Rothfuchs (1969) 110-121.
[62] Rothfuchs (1969) 121-133.
[63] Soares Prabhu (1976).
[64] Brown (1988) 104. Brown summarizes his results: 1) 'It is Matthew himself who added the formula citations to the Gospel tradition'. 2) 'In many instances, he was the one who first recognized the applicability of a particular text to a particular incident in Jesus' career.' 3) 'In such cases he seems to have chosen the OT text tradition that best illustrated this applicability or even to have made his own translation into Greek to heighten the applicability'. 4) 'In fewer instances, the applicability of a text was detected in a pre-Matthean stage of tradition, and Matthew was satisfied to reproduce the citation as it was already known'. 5) For Matthew, these citations did more than highlight incidental agreements between the OT and Jesus. He introduced them because they fit his general theology of the oneness of God's plan (a oneness already implicitly recognized by the appeal to the OT in early Christian preaching) and, especially, because they served some of his own particular theological and pastoral interests in dealing with a mixed Christian community of Jews and Gentiles'.
[65] Stanton (1992) was first published in 1987.
[66] Davies and Allison 1:29-58; 3:573-577.
[67] Stanton (1992) 359.

4) Finally, the purpose of the quotations is primarily Christological. This Christological emphasis is shown, for example, in the infancy narrative: Jesus is Emmanuel, God with us (1:23). This theme is echoed again at 18:20 and 28:20. At 2:6, Jesus is the one who will shepherd God's people Israel. In 2:15, Jesus is God's son. Even though the final two quotations have challenged exegetes historically, in 2:17-18 at the least, Matthew links Jesus' story with the story of Israel in regard to Exodus and Exile. Jesus is called Ναζωραῖος in 2:23, and 'the most likely explanation of this apparently odd designation is that Jesus is seen as the messianic *neser* or "branch" and the *nazir* or "holy one" of God'.[68]

One of Stanton's points is especially interesting for understanding Matthew's use of his sources from the biblical traditions. This point is number one above: the original source of Matthew's redactional activity could have been inspired by the last part of Mark 14:49, 'But let the scriptures be fulfilled' (ἀλλ' ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί). Stanton does not develop this but it is worth exploring this observation. The context is the betrayal and arrest of Jesus and his response to his would-be assailants. It has the fulfillment theme and is a comment by Jesus, not the writer. Mk 14:48-50 reads:

> But one of those who stood near drew his sword and struck the slave of the high priest, cutting off his ear. Then Jesus said to them, 'Have you come out with swords and clubs to arrest me as though I were a bandit? Day after day I was with you in the temple teaching, and you did not arrest me. But let the scriptures be fulfilled.' All of them deserted him and fled.

Matthew's redaction in 26:52-54 and 56 emphasizes Jesus' authority, again highlighting his Christological agenda. He doubles the emphasis on the fulfillment

[68] Stanton (1992) 359-361. The final quote is from 361.

theme by introducing it twice with considerable development. The italicized text emphasizes Matthew's redaction. Matthew 26:51-56 reads:

> Suddenly, one of those with Jesus put his hand on his sword, drew it, and struck the slave of the high priest, cutting off his ear. *Then Jesus said to him, Put your sword back into its place; for all who take the sword will perish by the sword. Do you think I cannot appeal to my Father, and he will at once send me more than twelve legions of angels? But how then would the scriptures be fulfilled, which say it must happen in this way?"* At that hour Jesus said to the crowds, "Have you come out with swords and clubs to arrest me as though I were a bandit? Day after day I sat in the temple teaching, and you did not arrest me. *But all this has taken place,* so that the scriptures *of the prophets* may be fulfilled". Then all the disciples deserted him and fled.

Stanton's observations prove to be exceptionally helpful in understanding Matthew's approach to the biblical tradition. Matthew uses this source in Mark as a pattern for the way he uses the biblical tradition, especially the 'formula quotations.' This text would seem to support the observation of Dodd, and those who followed his lead, that Jesus' use of the biblical tradition, according to Matthew, shaped the way the early church would appropriate and use the biblical tradition.[69]

Finally, Davies and Allison[70] have thoroughly examined the textual evidence and claim that 'if Matthew cited a text that was already part of the Christian tradition, we might expect him to reproduce the familiar wording and so (especially in Markan and Q material) often follow the LXX. But when Matthew himself was the first to quote an OT passage we might expect him to offer a wording suitable to his purposes. In other words, it was the evangelist's wont to bring out from the storehouse of

---

[69] Dodd (1952) 109-110.
[70] Davies and Allison 1:29-58; 3:573-577.

Scripture things both old and new'.[71] They affirm Gundry's work and would agree with his well-known formula, 'Matthew the targumist'.[72]

2.4.1.2 Matthew's Use of Typology

A further point regarding Matthew's use of the biblical tradition has to do with his use of typology.[73] Typology has been defined as 'Incidents or entire episodes within the narrative that appear to be inspired in whole or part by OT passages, events or personages'.[74] While this approach is sometimes difficult to define, it is a basic dimension of Matthew's style for accomplishing his fulfillment theme. Matthew utilizes this promise-and-fulfillment strategy to indicate correspondences in history in relation to God's activity in the past and his present actions in Jesus. He not only uses the specific 'fulfillment' formula quotations to alert the reader to these correspondences but also uses explicit references and allusions to events and persons connected with Jesus. Matthew calls attention to OT persons and events to show that what God did in the past God is doing again in the present in the birth, death and resurrection of Jesus.

---

[71] Davies and Allison 3:575.

[72] Davies and Allison 3:575-576, '[That] Matthew was his own targumist, is supported by several observations. (i) The quotations are now assimilated to their Matthean contexts. (ii) Several quotations are hard to imagine as isolated proof texts. (iii) Outside the formula quotations Matthew both conflates texts and shows knowledge of more than the LXX...Against Stendahl, we follow Gundry... (iv) 8.17; 12.18-21; 13.35; and 21.4-5 are insertions into Markan material; so at least the placement of these is due to the redactor. (v) Most of the OT verses quoted in the formula citations are not otherwise cited in first-century Christian literature, which is consistent with Matthean production'.

[73] Aune (2003) 479. 'Typology, a modern term based on the Greek word τύπος ("pattern, symbol, model")... A "type" is usually reserved for what occurred earlier in history, which corresponds to that which occurs later, called an "antitype" (ἀντίτυπς, "that which corresponds to something else, copy, representation")... The promise-and-fulfillment schema is essential for typology: the OT is a book of prophetic promise that foretold an age of salvation that was to come, and for early Christians this age, the period of fulfillment, had arrived with Jesus of Nazareth and the early church'.

[74] Senior (1997) 107.

So, for example, the infancy narrative evokes a Moses typology.[75] The extent to which Matthew does this may be debated, but few scholars deny that a Moses typology is at work in Matthew's narrative. This is true also of the events in the infancy narrative in regard to an Israel typology.[76] For Matthew 'it is the place where the OT and the Gospel meet'.[77]

Typology is a presupposition of Matthew rather than a methodology *per se.* Hays calls Matthew's use of typology a 'narrative device, with or without explicit citation, through which the reader is encouraged to see Jesus as the fulfillment of OT precursors, particularly Moses, David, and Isaiah's servant figure'.[78] Matthew works out of the belief that the story of God's people in the past is relevant and has a bearing on the present. Or, to put it another way, the present is fulfilling the past. Typology is not the same as allegory because it is related to history; the present history is patterned in the sacred history of Israel and therefore the present is made holy by the typological parallels with the past.[79] In regard to the shepherd motif, there are a number of typological connections assumed by Matthew. Examples of this might be the Moses-Jesus typology (i.e. Messiah, deliverer, etc.) the David-Jesus typology (Son of David, royal heir of David's dynasty) and the Abraham-Jesus typology (Son of Abraham and the inclusion of the Gentiles in the plan of redemption). Typology connects, in a sacred fashion, the past with the present and the future in order to provide continuity of God's salvation story in the past with the present experience of God's activity.

---

[75] Allison (1993).
[76] Hays (2006) 66. 'Matthew also posits a typological identification of Jesus with Israel, so that Jesus becomes the one in whom the fate of Israel is embodied and enacted'.
[77] Brown (1988) 231.
[78] Hays (2006) 74.
[79] Woollcombe (1957) 39, further defines typology as 'linkages between events, persons, or things *within the historical framework of revelation'*, and allegorical interpretation as 'the search for secondary and hidden meaning underlying the primary and obvious meaning of a narrative'. 40 (italics his).

A second example, Mt 9:36, is intertextually related to Num 27:17. The typological correspondence argued below relates to Moses the shepherd who prays and appoints a successor, Joshua, in order that Israel will not be shepherdless. Jesus, the shepherd, also appeals for prayer (Mt 9:37-38) and appoints successors, the disciples, in order that the people of God will not be without a shepherd. As in the case of intertextuality, criteria for discerning typological correspondences will be necessary. Allison's 'broad guidelines'[80] will be utilized in this regard.

2.4.1.3 Relevance of this research for the shepherd texts

The review of Matthew's use of the OT and typology is relevant to the examination of the shepherd texts because the shepherd motif is drawn from the biblical tradition, either explicitly or implicitly. Also, even as the metaphor presents a constellation of ideas to the reader/hearer, the intertextuality of the biblical tradition will inform the reader/hearer concerning the shepherd texts. In light of the foregoing discussion it will be helpful to keep in mind what has been said about Matthew's use of the tradition especially in regard to those shepherd texts unique to him (so 2:6, 15:24 and 25:31-32). Matthew has five shepherd texts that describe Jesus in his birth, ministry and death. He employs the shepherd metaphor more than either Mark or Luke. Matthew shares Luke's one reference, the lost sheep parable from *Q* (Mt 18:12-

---

[80] Allison (1993) 21-23. 'A few broad guidelines for our task do exist...1. One text can only allude to or intentionally recall another prior to it in time. (Although not a problem for evaluating the New Testament's use of the Jewish Bible, the Jewish Bible's use of its own traditions is another matter: chronological relationships are all too often disputed.) 2. Probability will be enhanced if it can be shown (on other grounds) that a passage's proposed subtext belongs to a book or tradition which held some significance for its author.... 3. In the absence of explicit citation or clear unacknowledged borrowing, a typology will not be credible without some combination of devices (3) – (6); [He is referring to 3 through 6 identified in note 12 above.] Without similar circumstances, for example, similar vocabulary will not suffice, and vice versa.... 4. A type should be prominent. A proposed typology based on Moses and the exodus owns an initial plausibility.... 5. An alleged typology has a better chance of gaining our confidence if its constituent elements have been used for typological construction in more that one writing.... 6. Unusual imagery and uncommon motifs: Two texts are more plausibly related if what they share is out of the ordinary'.

14//Lk 15:3-7), though Matthew applies the parable differently. With Mark, Matthew shares two references, both from the Old Testament: the phrase 'sheep without a shepherd' in Mk 6:34//Mt 9:36[81] and Mk 14:27//Mt 26:31 where the shepherd is 'struck' and the sheep are scattered which is a quote from Zech 13:7. Matthew has two shepherd texts from his own source(s) and alone uses the verb, ποιμαίνω, in the compound OT quote[82] in 2:6, 'a ruler shall shepherd my people'. In 25:31-32 the 'Son of Man' is described as the shepherd who 'separates the sheep from the goats.' Matthew alone implies that Jesus is the shepherd in the encounter with the 'Canaanite' woman when Jesus says that his mission is 'only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel' (Mk 7:24-30//Mt 15:21-28; cf. Mt 10:6). Matthew also associates the shepherd motif with other Christological phrases like Son of David and the Son of Man, and themes like the new Moses and the new David, the Messiah. Matthew's intertextual use of the OT is therefore of primary importance in regard to the shepherd texts.

2.4.2 Intertextuality and the use of the Biblical Tradition in the NT

A clarification is needed concerning Matthew's use of the biblical tradition and the perspective of this thesis. First, I will clarify the use of the term 'intertextuality'. Second, I will sort out the meaning and definition of 'quotation' and 'allusion' as used in this thesis. Third, I will elucidate the relationship between Matthew's quotations (and illusions) and their original contexts in the biblical tradition. For example, is Matthew primarily 'proof-texting' the biblical materials, oblivious to their context? Or does he assume the surrounding context in the biblical tradition as a 'backdrop' to the quote/allusion in his Gospel and therefore assume the reader/hearer will also be aware of the potential intertextual connections?

---

[81] Intertextually related to Num 27:17.
[82] Cf. The two texts are Mic 5:2(1) and II Sam 5:2.

2.4.2.1 Intertextuality: Quotations and Allusions

First, the term *intertextuality* is used as an umbrella term that describes the relation between previous texts (subtexts) and their use and influence on the current text that quotes or alludes to the previous textual tradition. The meaning of intertextuallity varies when used by different authors, but in its most comprehensive understanding it may include all potential relationships between texts. The focus here is concerned with 'only one species of intertextuality, namely, deliberate literary borrowing, the sort of borrowing that a text encourages its audience to discover, and recognition of which enlarges meaning'.[83] From the standpoint of this thesis, intertextuality in Matthew primarily involves the Jewish Scriptures, in both their Hebrew and Greek forms. The Matthean shepherd texts exist as part of a larger Jewish literary tradition.[84] The emphasis here is in regard to the intertextuality of the textual tradition.[85] A guiding concept in regard to intertextuality is that both author and reader/hearer share this common literary tradition of earlier texts. The more the reader/hearer is immersed in the textual tradition of the author and there is a shared textual worldview, the greater the capacity of the reader/hearer to appreciate the subtexts in quotations, allusion and typological pattern in regard to the tradition. Specifically, they are part of a web of relationships. Assuming that the earlier texts

---

[83] Allison (2000) ix. Cf. Moyise (2000) 41, '[Intertextuality] is best used as an "umbrella" term for the complex interactions that exist between "texts" (in the broadest sense).'

[84] While intertextuality has to do primarily with texts, this does not exclude the historical and cultural/social setting of the texts, with their history, and therefore, with their sources. This also includes the literary forms and the final literary and canonical shape of the text and the understanding of the shepherd metaphor in light of this.

[85] The literature is vast: representative for our purposes is Moyise (2000) 14-41, who provides a helpful discussion of intertextuality and the differences between quotation, allusion, and echo. His own approach discusses three influences between 'text and subtext' 17-18: 1) Intertextual Echo—the influence of the old upon the new; 2) Dialogical Intertextuality—the influence of the old and the new upon each other; and 3) Postmodern Intertextuality—the influence of all other texts, especially those known to the reader. It is in the sense of number one (1) above that the term intertextuality is being used in this thesis: i.e. the intertextual use of the biblical tradition by Matthew throughout his gospel and especially how it relates to the shepherd metaphor.

and traditions are known, this intertextuality allows the reader/hearer to understand and appreciate the Matthean use of the biblical tradition as a whole and the shepherd metaphor specifically.[86]

If intertextuality is the comprehensive or umbrella term used to describe Matthew's use of the biblical tradition generally, there are two main subcategories: 1) *quotation* and 2) *allusion.*[87] Because these two terms, along with other terms that come into the discussion, can have fluid meanings in NT research, it is important to define how they are understood. Stanley Porter has noted that, interestingly, there has not emerged a distinct consensus concerning the way terms referring to the use of the OT in the NT are defined.[88] The following definitions will clarify how this thesis intends to proceed concerning the use of *quotation* and *allusion* and also the much discussed term *echo.*[89]

---

[86] While the methodological approach of Hays (1989) 23 is not the primary method of this thesis, it has been influential among NT scholars and is informative in many ways.

[87] Moyise (2000) 17, 'However, if intertextuality is best used as an "umbrella" term then it requires subcategories to indicate the individual scholar's particular interest or focus'.

[88] Porter (1997) 79-96. Cf. more recently Wold (2005) 43-80 for an excellent discussion of the issues and the helpful criteria he develops.

[89] Porter (1997) 79-96 laments the lack of consensus or consistent definitions in regard to the descriptive terminology concerning the use of the OT in the NT, especially quotation, allusion, and echo. He gives little help in proposing definitions for the terms and therefore, by his silence, only points out the difficulty in determining direct, explicit or formal quotations and even more, the difficulty of identifying allusions or echoes. It should be noted that a number of scholars have attempted to clarify their use of quotation and allusion, to note only a few: Cf. Davies and Allison 1:29-57; Gundry (1967) 1-5, 9; R.T. France (1971) 259-263. Hays (1989) 29-33 developed seven criteria for 'Hearing Echoes' in an influential study primarily focused on Paul's use of the OT. Some NT scholars have used, adapted or critiqued his criteria and applied them to the rest of the NT: 1) *Availability*: Did the source precede the echo? 2) *Volume:* Are there explicit words or syntactical patterns repeated? 3) *Recurrence:* Is the source cited or alluded to elsewhere in the same work? 4) *Thematic Coherence:* Does the proposed echo fit the line of argument? 5) *Historical Plausibility:* Could the author have intended the meaning? Could his readers have understood it? 6) *History of Interpretation:* Have readers through the centuries, both critical and pre-critical, heard the same echoes? 7) *Satisfaction:* Does the proposed reading make sense? Does it illuminate the surrounding discourse? Does it produce for the reader a satisfying account of the effect of the intertextual relation?'
See also Paulien (1988) 37-53; Luz 1:156-164; Allison (1993) 19-21; Schaefer (1995) 66-91. Among the previous scholars Porter only interacts with Hays (1989) and does not interact or acknowledge the criteria, categories and/or definitions used by any of these scholars; others besides these could be cited as well. Since Porter's lament, scholarship has not reached any consensus on the terminology and that is highly unlikely to happen in the near future, given the diverse literary approaches that are being used in

1) *Quotation*: 'Quotations occur when an author reproduces the words or formulation of a literary source which is traceable from his choice of words or of turns of phrase. This involves the deliberate borrowing of significant and sufficient wording and phrasing "in a form in which one would *not* have used them had it not been for knowledge of their occurrence in this particular form in another source"'.[90] More succinctly, *quotation* may be defined as 'the reproduction of several consecutive words from another text'. Further, quotations may be identified as 'marked' or 'unmarked'.[91] Matthew has a number of ways he 'marks' a quotation. A quotation is considered 'marked' if it has some sort of an introductory formulaic reference to the subtext. So Matthew, for example, uses a word or a phrase: γέγραπται·: 'it is written'; the Matthean 'formula quotations,' as they are called, are marked off by some form of the introductory formula: πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν, 'fulfilled what was spoken'. Jesus' use of the phrase, οὐκ/οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε; 'have you never read?' would also fit this designation. For example, Mt 2:6, while not one of Matthew's 'formula' quotations, is a 'marked' quotation because of γὰρ γέγραπται διὰ τοῦ προφήτου·, 'for through the prophet it is written'.

'Unmarked' quotations are those quotes that have no such designation. Though this is not always the case, a quote can sometimes be discerned as standing apart from the narrative. This is best illustrated in Matthew by some of his formula quotations. Further, a quote may be identified as either a 'single' quote, coming from one subtext or a 'compound' quote, a combination of subtexts. So, for example, the 'single' quote from Zechariah 13:7 in Matthew 26:31 or the 'compound' quote from Micah 5:1(2)

---

biblical studies. Also, since Porter, helpful for our purposes are: Senior (1997) 89-115; Allison (2000) ix-xi; Moyise (2000) 14-41; Wold (2005) 43-80.

[90] Schaefer (1995) 68.

[91] Allison (2000) x.

and II Sam 5:2 in Matthew 2:6. As noted earlier, this is not the same as a 'mixed' quote, which refers to the mixed nature of the quote in regard to the use of the Hebrew and Greek sources of the quotation. Synonymous, in our usage, with *quotation* are explicit reference, direct quote, citation, specific or explicit citation. Any of these can be further identified as a 'single' or a 'compound' reference, depending on whether one or more subtexts are being referred to in any given quote.

In Matthean studies there is general agreement that the 'formula quotations' are unique to Matthew; they reflect his christological and broader theological purposes and are identifiable by the introductory formula noted earlier.[92] This would appear to be one of the central *functions* of the citation, marked or unmarked, single or compound, to lend authority and validity to the Gospel story. The diversity of the way Matthew uses the quotation; his formula quotes, quotations on the lips of Jesus and even the quotations by his opponents all strengthen his conviction concerning his intentions in writing the Gospel and declaring that Jesus is the Messiah.

2) *Allusion*: 'An "allusion" exists when one text shares enough with another text, even without reproducing several consecutive words from it, to establish the latter as a subtext to which an audience is being implicitly directed'.[93] Allusions can also be understood as being of two kinds, the intentional or direct allusion and the echo. The conscious allusion is the direct or intentional use of a phrase by the author, probably at least two or more words, to allude to a previous text.

An allusion is not a marked text. The allusion is simply embedded in the text with no particular attention drawn to it. Yet, it appears to be an intentional intertextual

---

[92] Again, the debate concerning the number, anywhere from ten to fourteen.

[93] Allison (2000) x. 'For instance, Jesus' declaration in Q 11:20, "If I by the finger of God cast out demons, the kingdom of God has come upon you," evokes Exod 8:19, where Moses' miracles move the Egyptian magicians to exclaim: "This is the finger of God."'

reference to a text in the tradition.[94] This is illustrated, for example, in the use of the phrase 'sheep without a shepherd', drawn from Numbers 27:17 and alluded to in Matthew 9:36. It is not a marked quotation but a phrase alluding to the earlier biblical tradition.[95]

The other kind of allusion is the echo. The echo is a single word or possibly a series of words that reminds the reader/hearer of another text, usually from scripture. The distinction between the allusion and the echo is difficult. Each case must be evaluated on its own merit. So for example, it will be argued that there is an echo of Jeremiah 50:6, and possibly others,[96] in Matthew 15:24 (cf. Mt 10:6). In an echo, authorial intention may or may not be involved. Again, each case must be looked at individually. Second, Matthew seems at times to echo different texts through the use of key words that have special importance in his overall narrative, for example, συνάγω: 'to gather'.[97] Here authorial intention is usually assumed. Third, the use of stock biblical language can also be an echo. For example, Matthew 2:1—the

---

[94] Wold (2005) 43-80. A recent attempt to develop some criteria to answer, 'what basis may there be for making a claim that one text is alluding to another'? He evaluates Hays (1989); Allison (1993); Williams (2001); Dimant (1988); Holm-Nielsen (1960); and Kittel (1981) and he develops his own synthesis and proposes these criteria—'*Categories for Identification:* ' The following are slightly edited: '(1) *Accessibility.* The author(s) had access to the source both in terms of the practical and chronological.
(2) *Vocabulary and Syntax.* The suspect non-explicit tradition shares specific and significant vocabulary or syntactical patterns with the proposed referent. (3) *Imagery and Motifs.* The more distinctive the imagery/motif of a suspect not-explicit tradition, when similar but not precise vocabulary or syntax occurs, and similarly unique imagery/motif occurs in a biblical source the likelihood increases. (4) *Literary Context.* Proven significance of a tradition established elsewhere in a document lends credibility to less pronounced occurrences that may be employing imagery without specific vocabulary shared with the referent. This is both a criterion of recurrence and volume. (5) *Similar Tradition(s).* The occurrence of similar but more conclusive occurrences(s) in (an)other document(s) establishes a greater likelihood of the occurrence of a non-explicit tradition. Precedence elsewhere enhances probability here'.

[95] This is discussed when Mt 9:36 is considered.

[96] E.g. Is 53:4; Ezek 34.

[97] For Matthew's special vocabulary cf. Davies and Allison 1:74-80; Gundry (1994) 674-682; Luz 1:54-72.

expression 'in the days of Herod the king' does not point to any specific text but is stock language of the biblical tradition.[98]

For different NT scholars there are different approaches concerning authorial intent and echo. Hays and Allison assume authorial intent may or may not be argued.[99] Others find the category of the echo as basically unhelpful or even obfuscating the issue.[100] In this thesis, authorial intent may or may not be the cause of the echo: each case must be evaluated on its own merit. When echo is understood as a way to nuance allusion, echo may be a helpful category. For all its subtleties it can have the capacity to further elucidate the primary text in light of the biblical tradition.

The function of the allusion is different from the quotation. Allusion engages the reader/hearer and is intended to cause the reader/hearer to bring to mind the biblical tradition, not only in a textual sense, but in a full contextual sense. Allusion is meant to broaden the horizons of understanding of the reader/hearer in order to explore the implications and possible significance of Jesus the Messiah. It is this process that potentially leads to the possibility that the unintentional echo is heard in the biblical tradition.

One final aspect of intertextuality should be noted--an 'intertextual chain'. What is meant by this is that a text has a history and emerges in different texts throughout the Biblical tradition. There are instances when a text is part of a larger

---

[98] Allison (1993) 6, 'We thus have here not an allusion to a particular text but—assuming the idiom was not dead—the utilization of what we may call biblical-sounding language. Readers familiar with the Greek Bible—and Matthew wrote with such in mind—would presumably have intuited a continuity between the story of Israel's sacred history and Jesus' story and hence would have read with solemnity, in anticipation of profound significance'.

[99] Hays (1989) 29, defines allusion and echo: '*Allusion* is an obvious intertextual reference and depends on authorial intention; *echo* is more subtle and does not depend on conscious intention; yet no systematic distinction can be made between the terms'.

[100] Wold (2005) 78-79, 'Less helpful may be an attempt to delineate between the terms "allusion" and "echo". The use of the terms represents intertextual occurrences that range from explicit ("quotation") to increasingly less explicit ("allusion" and "echo").'

complex of texts, rather than just one specific quote or allusion. An example of this related to Matthew's use of the biblical tradition is Mt 9:36 which is part of an intertextual chain with at least four links: Num 27:17 → I Kgs 22:17//II Chr 18:16 → Jdt 11:19 → Mk 6:34 → Mt 9:36 (some might argue that there could be another link in the chain, Zech 10:2; this will be discussed further below).

To summarize: intertextuality is used as a comprehensive term describing the whole of Matthew's use of the biblical tradition. Matthew quotes from that tradition, both indicating his quotes through verbal markers or phrases and also utilizing the tradition without introductory formula. The fundamental language of intertextuality in this discussion will be that of 'marked' or 'unmarked' quotations, which are considered to be explicit reference(s) to predecessor text(s). Allusions, like quotations, are of two types. Matthew alludes to texts from the OT through direct and/or intentional use and the more subtle echo. The purpose of both the quotations and the allusions is to expand the horizon of the reader/hearer to the larger context of the biblical background.

2.4.2.2 Intertextuality: Text, Sub-text and Context

This section concerns how Matthew's OT quotes and allusions and their relationship to their original contexts shape my interpretation of Matthew's shepherd texts. It will be argued throughout that Matthew assumes that the reader/hearer knows the surrounding context of the text(s). Matthew assumes that he shares the same cultural and religious environment as his readers/hearers, especially a common acquaintance with Israel's scripture. As a consequence, the way Matthew uses scripture to help tell the story of Jesus will expand his readers/hearers' 'horizons for

comprehension'.[101] For example, it will be argued when Psalm 72:10-11, 15 is alluded to in Matthew 2:11 the whole of Psalm 72 is brought to mind for the reader/hearer. As a result, the reader/hearer sees Jesus as the righteous-royal shepherd in light of the implied intertextual connection with the royal psalm and themes occurring in the psalm.

It was C. H. Dodd,[102] from a generation ago, who noted that NT quotations from the OT tended to come from certain areas of the OT. He argued that the quotations and allusions from the OT evoked the whole passage from which it had been selected. The texts were not to be understood as isolated 'proof-texts,' separated from their scriptural contexts. In 1952, he took issue with Harris, who argued for a primitive Testimony book comprised of independent proof-texts, a sort of anthology of quotations.[103] Harris had proposed that the original Book of Testimonies was one of the earliest written documents of the early church, if not the earliest. Matthew the Apostle was the compiler and this was the document Papias had referred to when he said that 'Matthew composed the Logia'.[104] Harris' arguments were, at least in Great Britain, the starting point of the modern study of the use of the Old Testament in the New.[105] Regarding Dodd's work, Barnabas Lindars wrote,

> This convincing study has struck the death-blow against the theory of a Testimony Book put forward by Rendel Harris...The importance of Professor Dodd's work can hardly be over-estimated. He has ascertained the passages which form "the sub-structure of all Christian theology", and has also shown the method which was used by the first Christians in formulating it.[106]

---

[101] Schaefer (1995) 68.
[102] Dodd (1952).
[103] Harris (1916-1920).
[104] Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.16. Cf. Moule (1962) 83-84, contra Dodd and supportive of Lindars.
[105] Dodd (1952) 25.
[106] Lindars (1961) 14-17.

Lindars argued there was reason to connect the OT quotations with the apologetic concerns of the early church, because of challenges and conflicts that arose from their proclamation of the *kerygma.* These apologetic concerns, according to Lindars, resulted in further exegetical reflection on and mining of, favorite blocks of OT material. Yet, the argument has been made, since Lindars, that the apologetic concerns followed the more immediate need of the early Christians to understand the passion, death and resurrection of Jesus.[107]

Granted the fact that Dodd's book was written prior to the publication of two *testimonia* documents found at Qumran—*4Q174* has three primary passages and *4Q175* has five texts—[108] it is somewhat amazing that his thesis was not just thrown out and forgotten because if the *testimonia* are understood as a proof-text approach to the use of the biblical tradition it speaks against Dodd's thesis. However, his thesis retained credibility not because the *testimonia* were not important but because his overall argument continued to be sound, as Lindars pointed out.[109]

In response to the phrase, 'according to the scriptures' (I Cor 15:3), Dodd asked, 'What scriptures, in particular?' inform the events of Jesus' life? Dodd studied the NT use of the Old and identified four categories: 1) Apocalyptic-Eschatological Scriptures; 2) The New Israel Scriptures; 3) Scriptures of the Servant of the Lord and the Righteous Sufferer; 4) Unclassified Scriptures. [110] He did not 'pretend that this [was] an

---

[107] Moo (1983) 392ff. If Moo is right, then he confirms Dodd's argument. Moo argues that the actual history and teaching of Jesus shaped the earliest church's understanding of how to approach the OT texts, in particular the passion narrative texts: 'as the early Christians began to think and preach about the significance of Jesus' death, they must have utilized categories provided by the OT—sacrifices, the atoning death of the Servant, the innocent sufferer.' 394.

[108] Vermes (1997) 493-496, *4Q174* contains II Sam 7:6-14 (Ex 15:17-18; Amos 9:11); Ps 1:1 (Isa 8:11; Ez 44:10) and Ps 2:1-2 with pesher comments and the supporting texts listed. *4Q175* contains Deut 5:28-29, 18:18-19, Num 24:15-17; Deut 33:8-11; and Josh 6:16. Fitzmyer (1957) 59-89.

[109] Lindars (1961) 14-17.

[110] Dodd (1952).

exhaustive list of scriptures in which the early Church found testimonies to the facts declared in the *kerygma*', but it was sufficient to make his point.[111] From this he noted that there were blocks of OT material that the early church used. He identified extended passages from the OT and classified these sections as '*wholes*, from which the NT quoted particular verses or sentences as pointers to the whole.'[112] In response to their experiences of the pre- and post-resurrection Jesus, the early Christians turn to the biblical tradition to help explain and proclaim the meaning of the recent events.[113] This was 'not a static achievement, but a process, and one which continued well through the New Testament period and beyond'.[114]

In reflecting on the question, 'Who was responsible for it [this 'original, coherent and flexible method of biblical exegesis']?'[115] Dodd noted that we are accustomed to say the early church. But in his now famous response, he pushed the answer further and noted, 'creative thinking is rarely done by committees' but it is 'individual minds that originate. Whose was this originating mind?'[116] His answer, 'the New Testament itself avers that it was Jesus Christ Himself who first directed the minds of His followers to certain parts of the scriptures as those in which they might find illumination upon the meaning of His mission and destiny'.[117] It was his way of giving an 'account for the beginning of rethinking the Old Testament by early Christians, which had its origin in their teacher, Jesus himself. Whatever one's

---

[111] Dodd (1952) 108.
[112] Dodd (1952) 126; Hunter (1961) 132-134, argues that his own research confirms Dodd. '...we discover that Dodd's hypothesis survives the test. The early Christians dealt not in single, isolated OT proof-texts chosen at random, regardless of the context, but in whole psalms or prophetic sections which must have been used before Paul's day as sources for *testimonia.*'
[113] Dodd (1952) 126-127.
[114] Dodd (1952) 108.
[115] Dodd (1952) 108-109.
[116] Dodd (1952) 109-110.
[117] Dodd (1952) 110.

assessment is of Dodd's 'not by committee approach' and the need for a 'creative mind' behind the whole process, it is important to point out that Dodd himself was not proposing some systematic or 'comprehensive scheme of biblical interpretation, after the manner of Lk. xxiv. 25-27, 44-45...'[118] His arguments, while maybe needing to be adjusted in light of continued research, are very judicious and genuinely provocative. Knowles' recent evaluation of Matthean exegesis supports Dodd's contention: 'for Matthew, messianic exegesis—the interpretation of Scripture with reference *to* the Messiah—is ultimately based on interpretation of Scripture *by* the Messiah. Jesus, it would appear, is his own best exegete'.[119] Matthew's use of Mk 14:49, as suggested above, would also support this.

Dodd's work was done over half a century ago and scholarship has not been idle. Dodd's work, of course, has also been critiqued and evaluated in many ways.[120] Dodd's thesis has generally been endorsed and stood the test of time. Taking into account the wider OT context, in light of the exegetical presuppositions and practices of the early church, has generally been regarded as helping to explain the NT writer's use of the OT.[121] Also considering the partial nature of his work, it is now presumed that while there may have been initial blocks of the OT where the earliest Christians turned to explain their faith in the earliest years (e.g. in the first few months and years after Jesus' death and resurrection) it was not long before they extended their search

---

[118] Dodd (1952) 110.
[119] Knowles (2006) 69-70, 'To underscore the point once more, the most important observation to be adduced from such evidence is that, whatever use of Scripture Matthew himself will make as editor and expositor of Gospel tradition, it claims to be based in the first instance on the practice and authority of the Messiah himself, both as to method and as to substance.'
[120] Marshall (1988) 1-18, deals with a number of Dodd's critics, so e.g. Sundberg (1959); Käsemann (1969) 82-107 and more recently Wilson (1979) 231-243; Black (1986) 1-17. Marshall does, with some understandable qualifications, maintain that Dodd's overall proposals have stood the test of time.
[121] Beale (1994) provides perspectives from both sides of the discussion and reprints classic articles.

into 'all the Scriptures' (Lk 24:27).[122] This does not deny that it is possible that *testimonia* collections existed, perhaps like those found at Qumran containing certain proof-texts with specific purposes or topics, but the *testimonia* emerged from the context of this exegetical endeavor. What Dodd wanted to show was that the use of the OT in the NT was not just proof-texting *per se.* For our purposes, Dodd helps us to see that Matthew's use of the shepherd tests from the OT are not isolated proof-texts, but was intended to exploit the whole context from which the shepherd texts originated.[123]

Following the general method set out by Dodd, I assume that the early Christian's quotation or allusion represents the wider narrative from which the quotation/allusion is derived. It is assumed that the audience knows the wider literary context from which the testimony has been drawn.[124] When considering Matthew's intertextual activity, it will be important to explore the different contexts from which the quote/allusion has been derived to see how it enriches our understanding of the shepherd metaphor.

2.5 Summary

In this chapter, I have examined various perspectives, assumptions, and methodological issues that will impact the remainder of this thesis.

First, I believe it is cogent to assume that Matthew's Jewish-Christian setting is post 70 C.E. and that Matthew is a Jew writing predominantly for Jews, but not to the

---

[122] Dodd (1952) 108-109.

[123] Dodd (1952) 132. Lindars (1961) 16-19 is supportive of Dodd at this point, 'By drawing attention to the blocks of material from which the testimonies have been drawn, Professor Dodd has shown that the primary meaning must be ascertained by reference to the whole passage. Generally quotations in the New Testament have not been selected with complete disregard of the original context. Their meaning has been already fixed by the process of working over whole passages which seem most relevant to the Church's fundamental doctrines'. Lindars argues that the early Church used the OT for apologetic reasons but wants to identify himself with Dodd's proposals and emphasize, 'this is no arbitrary digging out of proof-texts, without taking the context into account. On the contrary, the context with its Christian interpretation has already defined the meaning of them.'

[124] Dodd (1952) 126-127.

exclusion of Gentiles, who are a part of the Christian mission (28:18-20). For Matthew, Jesus as Son of God and Messiah is the center of his Jewish-Christian faith. Jesus is now the authoritative interpreter of the law and the fulfillment of Israel's hope. It is likely that there is still some ongoing debate between Jews and the Jewish-Christian communities regarding the significance of Jesus. Matthew is hopeful that Jews will recognize the unique status of Jesus and follow him. His intense polemic against the Jewish leadership confirms that there is a crisis of leadership among the Jewish people. Matthew responds to that crisis by presenting Jesus as the righteous and royal Shepherd anticipated in Israel's scripture. [125]

Furthermore, the position assumed here is that Matthew is a conservative redactor, utilizing his own literary techniques and distinctive stylistic features. Matthew uses Mark, or something like canonical Mark, and a source commonly referred to as *Q*, whether written or oral, and also material that was unique to him, known as *M*. With these sources he embeds biblical tradition as a primary source of authority confirming his understanding of who Jesus is. The extensive review of Matthean scholarship concerning Matthew's use of the OT is important because of the influence of the biblical tradition upon the five primary shepherd texts (2:6; 9:36; 15:24; 25:32; 26:31) and the shepherd metaphor generally. The analysis of how these texts will be given in Chapter Seven.

Third, Matthew's use of typology and intertextuality significantly influences how we interpret the shepherd texts. Matthew uses typology as a literary device to argue how the present fulfills the past, creating a new future for the people of God.

---

[125] The use of the shepherd metaphor in response to the crises of leadership in Israel at least goes back to Num 27:17 where Moses prays that the people will not be leaderless or 'sheep without a shepherd' and is developed by the exilic and postexilic prophets. This theme is assumed here but will be developed later in the thesis.

The shepherd motif is connected to a number of the Matthean typologies, including the Moses-Jesus, and David-Jesus typologies.

Fourth, Matthew quotes and alludes to the biblical tradition extensively. Regarding quotations, Matthew utilizes introductory phrases and formulas to *mark* his use of the OT (e.g. 26:31), but he also offers quotes that are *unmarked,* those without any formulaic introductions (e.g. 9:36). He also uses *mixed* quotes, as in Matthew 2:6, where he quotes Micah 5:2 and II Samuel 5:2. We also noted how difficult it was to distinguish 'allusions' from 'echoes'. For our purposes, when this thesis talks about scriptural 'allusions' we assume the author intended it, but with 'echoes' of scripture, authorial intent may or may not be the cause.

Finally, we noted the importance of intertextuality. The recent scholarship consensus is that Matthew and the NT writers in general were not only aware of the larger context from which their OT quotations derived, but were also banking on the fact that their readers/hearers knew that context. They were not proof-texting', but pointing to 'whole' texts within biblical tradition. Therefore, one of the tasks in the thesis is to consider how the original contexts of the quotations or allusions may further inform the reader concerning the shepherd metaphor.

Along with these perspectives, assumptions, and methodological considerations, this thesis recognizes that the shepherd motif is used metaphorically. Hence, it will be the focus of the next chapter to review theories of metaphor--what a metaphor is, how it functions and how a theory of metaphor helps us to appreciate the shepherd image.

CHAPTER 3
METAPHOR

3.1 Metaphor: Definitions, Theories and Approaches

Since the shepherd/sheep metaphor is central to this thesis, it is important to explore the issues of the use of literal and non-literal language. To clarify our understanding of metaphor is important for at least two reasons. The first reason is that the subject matter has to do with God. When we say, 'The Lord is my shepherd,' we are using language to attempt to describe who or what God is in relation to humanity. Metaphorical ways of speaking are a human way of saying something that cannot be adequately expressed through literal description. Since the subject matter is God, metaphorical language is essential because metaphor can 'be reality depicting without pretending to be directly descriptive.'[1] Metaphorical language in regard to God reminds us that God cannot be fully comprehended and helps us avoid the idolatry of limiting descriptions of God. Metaphorical language helps humankind to articulate differing perceptions of God.

The second reason for clarifying our understanding of metaphor is to explore how metaphor conveys meaning in general so that we can better understand metaphorical language about God. The academic study of figurative speech and the special attention devoted to the nature of metaphor, especially during the last half of the twentieth-century, makes it impossible to consider all the issues.[2] It is important to note that this section relies heavily on the work of Janet Martin Soskice.[3] In what

---

[1] Soskice (1985) 145.
[2] The literature is vast. Ortony (1993a) xiii, notes that a bibliography of metaphor publications from 1985-1990 contained 'some three and a half thousand references.'
[3] Soskice (1985).

follows 1) I will give a brief overview concerning the relationship between the literal and non-literal/metaphorical use of language. 2) I will offer a working definition of metaphor through a discussion of what metaphorical language *is*. 3) A brief review will be given of some of the main theories of metaphor in order to appreciate how metaphor *functions*. 4) Finally, I will clarify the approach taken in this thesis regarding the shepherd/sheep metaphor.

Linguistic discussions about the relationship between the literal and the metaphorical have been long and complex. The attempt here is to explore only a few highly important issues in relation to the discussion.[4] The literal senses of words can be identified apart from context or local use as reported in a dictionary or lexicon. [5] The literal word has both a sense and denotation. The sense corresponds to the dictionary definition and the denotation is the relation between the lexeme and the particular persons, situation, place, things or state of affairs that it designates.[6] So *sheep* can denote not only an individual animal but also a class of animal. It is, therefore, important to note that the literal sense of a word can have a clear *sense* independent of context. Yet, it is in the context of usage and at the level of complete utterance that both the literal and metaphorical uses of language become meaningful in terms of denotation. Soskice's shorthand on the relationship between the literal and the metaphorical is helpful for our purposes: 'we shall say that literal speech is

---

[4] E.g. Some of the issues are: 1) Distinctions between literal (empirically respectable) language and metaphorical (emotive/decorative/devaluation) language. 2) Questions concerning established or conventional uses. 3) Distinctions between 'literal meaning' and 'metaphorical meaning'. 4) What are the distinctions between 'metaphorical truth' and 'literal truth'? 5) Does metaphor have both a literal meaning and a metaphorical meaning? 6) For a metaphor to have cognitive significance, should it be reducible to a literal statement without diminishing loss of significance? For fuller treatments cf. esp. Soskice (1985) Chapter 5; Caird (1980) 131-133; Kittay (1987) 19-22, 40-55; Macky (1990) 32-39.

[5] The cognitivist theorists would argue against this distinction and that their approach 'has destroyed the traditional literal-figurative distinction...' Cf. Lakoff (1993) 204-205.

[6] Soskice (1985) 52.

accustomed speech.'[7] So, when an utterance is literal, the terms are being used in a convincing manner. Metaphor is not the same as the literal, in that the metaphorical sense is only possible in the context of a complete utterance. Put another way, metaphor is not a single word or idea, but occurs in relation to something else. Again, Soskice: 'We also speak, for brevity's sake, of "metaphors" or "metaphorical utterances" where the reader should understand that we mean these utterances as they occur in complete contexts of speech.'[8] For example, the phrase, 'sheep without a shepherd' is context dependent. We therefore have to know the concrete context in order to determine whether a word/phrase must be taken literally or metaphorically.

3.1.1 What Metaphor *Is*

For our purposes we will attempt to clarify the nature of metaphor by discussing what a metaphor *is* and then discuss the *function* of metaphor according to the different theories.[9] Put simply, a metaphor is a figure of speech. In literary criticism, the metaphor is considered a kind of trope,[10] one of a number of figures of speech. According to the ancient rhetorician Quintilian, metaphor is the most common trope. It is often referred to as the 'chief amongst the tropes.'[11] Other tropes he identifies are metonymy, autonomasia, metalepsis, synecdoche, catachresis, allegory, hyperbole, and periphrasis.[12] Probably the most discussed trope in relation to metaphor is 'simile,' generally identified by the use of *like* or *as*, which makes it a trope of comparison. Yet while some theorists want to make a clear distinction

---

[7] Soskice (1985) 69.
[8] Soskice (1985) 69.
[9] For a helpful overview (up to 1981). Cf. Johnson (1981a).
[10] Aune (2003) 478, 'from the Latin word *tropus* ('figure of speech'), derived from the Greek word τρόπον ("turn, turning"), refers to a word that has been "turned" from its normal meaning and hence is a 'figure of speech.' Quintilian (ca. 35-95) defines *tropus* as 'the artistic alteration of a word or phrase from its proper meaning to another.' (*Instituto oratoria* 8.6.1)'.
[11] Soskice (1985) ix, 10.
[12] *Inst.* 8.6.4 and on other tropes, *Inst.* 9.1.5-6. For modern discussions of tropology cf. Soskice (1985) Chapter 4, Caird (1980) 133-143, Macky (1990) 40-42.

between the two, others, while making a distinction, contend that the two can be closely related.[13] Soskice clarifies her understanding of this issue by noting that in many cases a metaphor and simile are 'textually different' but 'functionally the same.'[14]

We will take our initial working definition of metaphor from Soskice, '*metaphor is that figure of speech whereby we speak about one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another*'.[15] The nature of metaphor is a mode of language use and so must be considered first in its linguistic setting as a figure of speech.[16] This nominal definition intentionally avoids a full functional description of metaphor. The reason for this is to attempt to describe what a metaphor *is* and to avoid the possible confusion arising from using terms often associated with different theories of metaphor, for example, 'substitution,' 'comparison,' or 'interaction'. While it will be pointed out later that a good metaphor will encourage non-linguistic associations and a network of implications, both in terms of ideas and things, it is important to emphasize here that it is fundamentally a figure of speech and linguistic in nature.[17]

---

[13] Soskice (1985) 59, 'can say that metaphor and simile share the same function and differ primarily in their grammatical form.' Black (1979a) 31-32, wants to make a strong and clear distinction between simile and metaphor because 1) simile lacks the impact of metaphor and 2) cannot rival the richer interactive meaning of metaphor. On the other hand, Caird (1980) 144, 'If a comparison is explicit we call it a simile, and it is meant to be taken literally. If it is implicit we call it a metaphor, and it is non-literal. This distinction does not exhaust the difference between simile and metaphor, which we must explore further at a later stage; but for our immediate purpose it is useful to regard them as interchangeable'.

[14] Soskice (1985) 59.

[15] Soskice (1985) 15, her emphasis.

[16] This is one of the basic presuppositions that is challenged by the 'cognitive' view of metaphor and will be explored further below. Cf. Kovecses (2002); Lakoff (1992); Lakoff and Johnson (1981).

[17] Soskice (1985) 17-18, 'But our reason for denying that metaphor is a non-linguistic mental event is not that we cannot make sense of such a notion (since clearly we have non-linguistic thoughts), but simply that, as a figure of speech, metaphor is linguistic'.

Further, it is also the case that no *one* syntactic form identifies or defines a metaphor.[18] Soskice and others argue that it is not accurate to place the emphasis only on the individual word as if the individual word is the metaphor and the primary bearer of meaning.[19] No words stand alone as metaphors, but words can, in a linguistic setting, be used as a metaphor. For example, the phrase 'sheep without a shepherd' is understood according to its linguistic setting, as either literal speech or non-literal (metaphorical) speech based on the linguistic context of the utterance. So, a metaphor becomes apparent as it is established in a wider context and should not be limited to a word or even a sentence.[20]

A further observation concerning the nature of metaphor is that once a metaphor has been established in a given context it may then be *extended.* We can make a distinction between establishing a simple metaphor and developing an extended metaphor. A metaphor is established as soon as the reader/listener is able to recognize that one thing is being spoken of in terms suggestive of another. An extended metaphor appears when the established metaphor is developed and expanded for as long as the writer/speaker wants to extend the metaphor. Psalm 23 can illustrate both the established metaphor and an extended metaphor. The 'Lord is my shepherd' (v. 1) is the established metaphor and then it is extended in the following verses (vv. 2-4). In the case of Psalm 23, a question arises for the reader as to whether or not the shepherd metaphor continues to the end of the psalm. Does the metaphor change after verse 4? The answer one gives depends on how much one knows about nomadic

---

[18] Soskice (1985) 18-19.
[19] Soskice (1985) 16 'metaphor is a mode of language use and the study of metaphor should begin in a linguistic setting.' Richards (1936) and others following him; e.g. Ricoeur (1977) 65, 'Hence, we will speak from now on of the *metaphorical statement'*. His emphasis.
[20] Soskice (1985) 21, responding to Ricoeur's emphasis on the sentence, 'We need not, however, replace the hegemony of the word with hegemony of the sentence'.

shepherds and their traditions concerning hospitality and generosity in ancient cultures.[21]

This last example from Psalm 23 highlights another point concerning metaphor: in order for a metaphor to be fully understood as metaphor, there must be a shared understanding both of language and conceptual content. This aspect of metaphor will be developed further below. The summary of Soskice is helpful:

> [T]he minimal unit in which a metaphor is established is semantic rather than syntactic; a metaphor is established as soon as it is clear that one thing is being spoken of in terms that are suggestive of another and can be extended until this is no longer the case. It can be extended, that is, until the length of our speaking "of one thing in terms suggestive of another" makes us forget the "thing" of which we speak.[22]

Recapitulating, therefore, in this initial section we have attempted to clarify what metaphor *is*. First, metaphor as a unit is defined semantically rather that syntactically.[23] To put it another way, metaphor is a trope in a linguistic context. It is in the linguistic context that the nature of metaphor is established, as soon as the reader/listener is able to recognize that one thing is being spoken of in terms suggestive of another.[24] Once a metaphor is established in a given linguistic context, it may or may not be extended. Finally, before readers or listeners can recognize a metaphor, they must have a shared understanding of language and conceptual understanding of the metaphor.

---

[21] The question as to whether we are still dealing with the shepherd metaphor at the end of the Psalm, e.g. vv. 5-6, is discussed below.
[22] Soskice (1985) 23.
[23] I agree with the way Soskice has argued this point, supporting her argument with I. A. Richards and Paul Ricouer on p 21. But this point has been disputed, e.g. by Sue Patterson in a review of Soskice's book: 'However I do not see that it is possible to make a clear distinction between semantic and syntactic: if the meaning of an utterance depends on a certain grammatical structure such as predication, how is it possible to distinguish the syntactical form of the utterance from the semantical content? Both are brought together and interact (see Wittgenstein's dictum of meaning as use in his *Philosophical Investigations*...). It is our use of words in our everyday lives which connects our language with the physical world. This connection relies on our social conventions regarding language use' (1993) 2, n. 3. The relation between the semantic and the syntactic is discussed further in the section considering the 'Incrementalist Approaches'.
[24] Soskice (1985) 21-22.

3.1.2 How Metaphor *Functions*

For a reader to understand either a word or a figure of speech in its context, they must understand how it functions. Various authors have emphasized differing ways and degrees of function and differing impact or richness of meaning according to their specific theories of metaphor. One of the issues concerning 'How metaphor *functions*' involves how metaphors should be categorized—either fundamentally as a linguistic phenomenon, or more generally as a communication phenomenon, or as a phenomenon of thought, cognition or mental representation.

It is possible to identify four categories of approaches to metaphor: 1) Classical Approaches, 2) Pragmatic Approaches, 3) Interactionist or Incrementalist Approaches, and 4) Cognitive Approaches. A brief survey of each approach will clarify the differences.

3.1.2.1 Classical Approaches

The Classical approach to metaphor is represented by Aristotle and Quintilian.[25] Aristotle's comments on metaphor have been traditionally understood as proposing a theory of 'substitution' or 'ornamentation'. Recently, this interpretation of Aristotle has been questioned.[26] Chapter 21 of Aristotle's *Poetics* is one of the primary texts considered:

> Metaphor is the application of a strange term either transferred from the genus and applied to the species or from the species and applied to the genus, or from one species to another or else by analogy, an example of a term transferred from genus to species is 'Here *stands* my ship'. Riding at anchor is a species of standing... An example of transference from one species to another is '*Drawing off* his life with the bronze' and '*Severing* with the tireless bronze',

[25] Quintilian, *Instituio Oratoria* 8.1-19, on Quintilian cf. Soskice (1985) 6-10.
[26] E.g. by both Soskice (1985) and Ricoeur (1977).

> where 'drawing off' is used for 'severing' and 'severing' for 'drawing off', both being species of 'removing'. Metaphor by analogy means this: when B is to A as D is to C, then instead of B the poet will say D and B instead of D.'[27]

A detailed discussion of this passage and other passages from Aristotle is not necessary but several points may be noted.[28] The traditional interpretation of metaphor makes six points from Aristotle's comments:[29] 1) Aristotle seems to refer to metaphor as primarily an individual word, a property of the word and a linguistic phenomenon, rather than a sentence or cognitive idea.[30] 2) Aristotle seems to understand metaphor to include other types of transfers with other figures of speech, e.g. in the quote above, synecdoche and hyperbole. 3) The primary focus in the quotation above is on the terms 'metaphor' (μεταφορά, to carry across) and 'transferred' (ἐπιφορά, to carry over). This seems to be the reason that most have understood Aristotle (and Quintilian with him) to have a theory of substitution. 4) Metaphor is based on a resemblance between the two entities that are compared and identified. For example, Achilles must share some features with lions in order for us to be able to use the word *lion* as a metaphor for Achilles. 5) Metaphor is a conscious and deliberate use of words, and one must have a special talent to be able to do it and do it well. 6) Metaphor is a figure of speech that one can do without; it is a kind of ornament or an embellishment of language.[31]

---

[27] Aristotle, *Poetics* 21.7-13 (Fyfe, LCL).

[28] The common sources drawn upon for Aristotle's views on metaphor are here in the *Poetics* and book 3 of the *Rhetorica* where he treats 'style' (λέξις), and in 3.10-11where he treats the source of popular and witty sayings, and his four types of metaphor.

[29] The following points are how Aristotle has *traditionally* been interpreted. Soskice, and others, take issue with the traditional interpretation and the implications drawn; e.g. that he sets forth primarily a theory of substitution and/or an ornamentalist view. Cf. Soskice (1985) 8-14. Ricoeur (1977) 16-24 also takes exception.

[30] Soskice (1985) 5, 'In any case, whether as noun or name or word in general, Aristotle tends to speak of metaphor as a phenomenon of the individual word rather than of any wider locus of meaning such as the sentence...'

[31] This perspective of ornamentation possibly anticipates some of the pragmatic approaches considered below.

These elements of the classical approach are now commonplace, but as Soskice emphasizes, it is unsatisfactory to view metaphor as simple substitution of a decorative word or phrase for an ordinary one.[32] Metaphor is active in the extension of our understanding and has the capacity to fill what linguists now refer to as lexical gaps. Paul Ricoeur also rejects the notion that Aristotle implies a *substitution* theory of metaphor. He says: '[T]he fact that the metaphorical term is borrowed from an alien domain does not imply that it substitutes for an ordinary word which one could have found in the same place.'[33] Thus, Aristotle is taken to favor the idea of linguistic interaction. Still, the contention remains among many that Aristotle implies a *substitution* theory of metaphor. *'Metaphor is defined in terms of movement.'* It is 'the notion of *epiphora* (the transposition from one pole to another)' that Ricoeur emphasizes.[34] He thus concludes: 'The modern authors who say that to make a metaphor is to see two things in one are faithful to this feature'.[35]

If Aristotle did not primarily view metaphor as substitution of an ornamented term for the literal one, then what is the origin of the substitution view? In attempting to answer this question, some modern critics charge Aristotle's description of metaphor as being 'full of ambiguities when regarded as a definition'[36] or else that 'Aristotle himself was confused on this point and thus provided grounds for the modern critiques' that have ensued.[37] Yet, in spite of the ambiguities and confusion,

---

[32] Soskice (1985) 8.
[33] Ricoeur (1977) 19. On Ricoeur cf. Thiselton (1992) 351-358.
[34] Ricoeur (1977) 17,19; his emphasis.
[35] Ricoeur (1977) 24.
[36] Soskice (1985) 5.
[37] Ricoeur (1977) 19.

two observations are identified that lead to the substitution view: 1) the history of rhetoric and rhetorical methods and 2) the interpretation and critique of the rationalists and empiricists.[38] It is partially correct that classical rhetoric did emphasize metaphor as primarily substitution, because of its importance as chief among the tropes. But Soskice qualifies this perspective by pointing out that it was not so much the rhetoricians who created the substitution view but their empiricist critics. The empiricists were suspicious of rhetorical methods and therefore interpreted rhetoricians as having the *substitution* view. Specifically she identifies the critique of Hobbes and Locke concerning rhetoric and figurative speech as a primary source of the substitution view. In *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* Locke argues that the use of 'figures of speeches and allusion in language' should be avoided by any clear-thinking person.[39] It is in this modern critique of the use and abuse of rhetoric that Locke identifies Aristotle (and also Quintilian) with the substitution view. This leads to the *ornamentation* view, which holds that metaphor is nothing more than an ornament of language, and at best, unnecessary and problematic, or at worst, 'deceiving'.[40] In the discussion of the differing theories, the *comparison* theory is simply a more nuanced consideration of the *substitution* view.[41] The comparison approach is still essentially *ornamental* in that two like things are simply compared but the metaphor might be replaced by a literal equivalent.[42]

---

[38] Soskice (1985) 10-12.
[39] Soskice (1985) 12-13.
[40] Soskice (1985) 13, Locke concludes his attack on figurative language, 'Eloquence, like the fair sex, has too prevailing beauties in it to suffer itself ever to be spoken against. And it is in vain to find fault with those arts of deceiving, wherein men find pleasure to be deceived'.
[41] Soskice (1985) 12-14, 24-26.
[42] Soskice (1985) 26.

3.1.2.2 Pragmatic Approaches

The perspective that metaphor is basically ornamentation leads to the contemporary pragmatic approaches. Two approaches can be classified here: 1) emotive theory,[43] and 2) reinterpretation theory.[44]

The emotive theory in regard to metaphor is much like an emotive understanding of religious language or ethics. The impact or importance of metaphor is basically affective only. This view of metaphor often assumes a theory of meaning associated with the logical positivists of the mid-twentieth century. One basic idea of positivism was that reality could be precisely described through the use of language that was clear, unambiguous, and *literally* descriptive. Other uses of language were meaningless, for they violated the empiricist criterion of meaning. During the heyday of logical positivism, literal language reigned supreme. Therefore, the use of metaphor was a deviant use of language and a detriment to cognitive content. While emotivists argued that the cognitive content was lost, the use of metaphor gave language an unspecified emotional impact.

Donald Davidson argues against any theory of metaphor that has any specific interactive or cognitive perspective on metaphor.[45] For Davidson, 'metaphors mean what the words, in their most literal interpretation, mean, and nothing more.'[46] He does not want to be associated with the emotivist view described above but, from his perspective, sets forth a more nuanced approach.[47] Yet, as will become clear, his

---

[43] Soskice (1985) 26-31; Davidson (1979). Davidson is not a 'pure emotivist.' Soskice, 27-31, discusses his theory in regard to its similarities and differences with emotivism.
[44] Boeve and Feyaerts (1999) 8; Swineburne (1999); Maier (1999); Pires de Oliveira (1999).
[45] Davidson (1979).
[46] Davidson (1979) 30.
[47] Davidson (1979) 30-31.

position is that metaphor has no cognitive meaning because it is not literal language. He argues that the important distinction to be made is 'between what words mean and what they are used to do.'[48] His position is that metaphor has no special cognitive meaning, but its efficacy, if there is any, is from its pragmatic force. The only cognitive meaning is from the literal meanings of its various parts.[49] The meaning of language is free from context, and when language has a context, the concern is not with meaning but with use.[50] He agrees that a metaphor is only a metaphor in context, but the question is not one of meaning but of use. Any cognitive content as metaphor may have is determined by the literal meanings of the words.[51]

Basic to Davidson's view is his argument concerning 'meaning' and his contention that 'meaning' is context-free. Eve Kittay develops a helpful argument in regard to Davidson's position and the specific contention that meaning is context-free by arguing that 'literal language is no more context-free than metaphor is, each revealing different aspects of the context-dependence of both literal and metaphorical language.'[52] Kittay develops her argument along three lines.[53] Her first two lines of

---

[48] Davidson (1979) 31, 'I think metaphor belongs exclusively to the domain of use. It is something brought off by the imaginative employment of words and sentences and depends entirely on the ordinary meanings of those words and hence on the ordinary meanings of the sentences they comprise'.
[49] Davidson (1979) 43, 'We must give up the idea that a metaphor carries a message, that it has a content or meaning (except, of course, its literal meaning).
[50] Davidson (1979) 31, 'Literal meaning and literal truth conditions can be assigned to words and sentences apart from particular contexts of use'.
[51] Davidson (1979) 39. 'The argument so far has led to the conclusion that as much of metaphor as can be explained in terms of meaning may, and indeed must, be explained by appeal to the literal meanings of words'.
[52] Kittay (1987) 100. Kittay offers an extended refutation and thorough critique of Davidson's position; she also includes Searl (1979) in her discussion: 96-123.
[53] Kittay (1987) 100. 'The first emerges directly from the study of metaphor itself; the second concerns the implicit background assumptions against which all language is understood; the third involves the profound ambiguity inherent in most terms of a natural language'.

argument concern the context independence of sentence meaning and the last concerns word meaning.[54] Kittay offers the following illustration:

> [A] challenge to the contextual independence of literal language is posed when we consider how we come to recognize that an utterance is metaphorical.... 3.1 Smith is a plumber and 3.2 The rock is becoming brittle with age, may be interpreted literally or metaphorically. 3.1 is metaphorical if we know that Smith is not a plumber but a surgeon; 3.2 is metaphorical if we are speaking of an ageing professor emeritus.[55]

Kittay's point is much the same as the earlier illustration concerning, 'sheep without a shepherd.' Context determines whether the meaning concerns animals left unattended or a metaphor descriptive of people left leaderless.

Davidson's approach to meaning does not give genuine recognition to the fact that metaphors actually do something, and if they do something it must be because they say something.[56] He comes close to acknowledging this when he says, 'This is not to deny that there is such as thing as metaphorical truth, only to deny it of sentences. Metaphor does lead us to notice what might not otherwise be noticed, and there is no reason, I suppose, not to say these visions, thought, and feelings inspired by the metaphor, are true or false.'[57] Yet, in the very next sentence he states, 'If a sentence used metaphorically is true or false in the ordinary sense, then it is clear that it is usually false.'[58] Earlier he noted that metaphor 'nudges us into noting.'[59] But in the end his solution to what metaphors mean is simply to deny that they mean anything at all.[60]

---

[54] Kittay (1987) 'Considerations from metaphor.' 100-106; 'Contextual background assumptions'. 104-106; Context-dependence based on systematic ambiguity'. 106-113.
[55] Kittay (1987) 100.
[56] Soskice (1985) 30.
[57] Davidson (1979) 39.
[58] Davidson (1979) 39.
[59] Davidson (1979) 36.
[60] Soskice (1985) 28, Cf. the detailed response of Max Black (1979) 181-192 to Davidson.

Another version of the pragmatic approach came to the fore with the development of the speech act theory associated with John R. Searle.[61] In this approach a clear

distinction is made between (*literal*) sentence meaning (*semantics*) and utterance meaning (*pragmatics*), which is described as the meaning intended by the speaker. When a speaker uses metaphorical language, the only real meaning in the statement is the literal interpretation that is made by the hearer. As a result, metaphor is placed outside 'normal' speech acts and is referred to as an 'indirect' speech act. An acceptable interpretation of a metaphorical utterance can only be arrived at by the reinterpretation of the utterance by the hearer into the literal interpretation. A metaphorical utterance is an incorrect interpretation attempt by the speaker of the literal meaning, hence the name *reinterpretation theory.* Soskice summarizes it well:

> Searle, unlike Davidson, freely speaks of the *meaning* of metaphor, but does so by using 'meaning' in two ways: 'what the sentence means literally' and what 'the speaker means metaphorically'. It is important to note that both Searle and Davidson would say that what the *sentence* means is what it means literally, and so would disagree with the suggestion that the same sentence has both a literal meaning and metaphorical meaning.[62]

Searle and Davidson might reply to Soskice that they are only interested in the truth and falsity of the sentences and what they mean, not what the speaker means or is trying to do when using sentences. Yet, part of the reality of everyday language and the process of communication involves an attempt to understand what a speaker means and hopes to do in the act of communication. Their approach distances them from the very everyday language they hope to describe.

---

[61] Searle (1979). Searle's article remains the same in the rev. ed. of Ortony (1993).
[62] Soskice (1985) 91-92.

3.1.2.3 Interactionist or Incrementalist Approaches[63]

We have seen that the classical theories are often associated with some type of *substitution* or *ornamentation* theory. The content or meaning of a metaphor is superfluous and could be expressed, just as well, without using a metaphor, hence the idea of metaphor as ornamentation. In pragmatic approaches metaphor is simply affective (emotivism) and has no meaning or must be reinterpreted literally to have any real meaning: metaphor becomes irrelevant. The *incrementalist* approaches disagree with both of the above. The *incrementalist* approach, sometimes referred to more generally as the *interactionist* theory or as *interactionism*, emerged in the twentieth century in response to the classical and pragmatic approaches. As a generic theory it is associated with people like I. A. Richards[64] and later Max Black[65] and other diverse applications of the theory by Monroe Beardsley,[66] Paul Ricoeur,[67] Eva Kittay[68] and others.[69] Generally the incrementalists propose that what is said by way

---

[63] Soskice (1985) 31-51. *Incrementalist* is Soskice's word and her category heading for the different *interactionist* approaches. While not as well known it has the advantage of being a broader term than *interactionist;* the word *interactionism* is often specifically associated specifically with Max Black. Again, Soskice is a dominant influence in the following discussion.

[64] Richards (1936). Richards' work is basic to the modern exploration of metaphor and continues to play an important role in any discussion concerning the theory of metaphor.

[65] Black (1962), (1979a), (1979b). Black is known for the 'interaction' theory and borrowed heavily from Richards. From Black's perspective Richards' terminology was too 'psychological' and he attempted to change this but he has been criticized for some of the terminology he has used to describe metaphor. Cf. Soskice (1985) 41-43 and esp. 45, n 55.

[66] Beardsley (1958), (1967); Cf. Soskice (1985) 32-38, who discusses at length Beardsley's 'controversion' theory.

[67] Ricoeur (1976), (ET 1977), (1979). (1976) 52-53, 'Within a tension theory of metaphor, ...a new signification emerges, which embraces the whole sentence.... Tension metaphors are not translatable because they create their meaning. This is not to say that they cannot be paraphrased, just that such a paraphrase is infinite and incapable of exhausting the innovative meaning.... [metaphor] has more than an emotive value because it offers new information. A metaphor, in short, tells us something new about reality'.

[68] Kittay (1987). Kittay's contribution attempts to bridge the gap between the interactionists and the cognitivists. Her *'perspectival stance'* will be briefly reviewed below as a transition from the 'interactionist' theories to the 'cognivitists'.

[69] Johnson (1981); Macky (1990); McFague (1982); Masson (2001); Nielsen (1992); Ortony (1979, rev. ed. 1993); Porter (1983); Sacks (1979).

of metaphor is unique and cannot be said in any other way and that the dynamic at work in the parts of a metaphor produces new cognitive meanings. How metaphors function to do this is what is debated. For the purposes of this thesis, the focus will be to consider generally the interactionist theories,[70] and specifically the interanimation theory of Soskice.[71]

Interactionism is initially associated with I. A. Richards and then developed by Max Black. Richards' theory is referred to as the *tensive* view because he emphasizes the conceptual incompatibility or *tension* between the two terms in the metaphor. He proposed a set of terms for talking about metaphors: the *topic* or *tenor* and the *vehicle* or *ground.* So, in the metaphor 'The Lord is my shepherd,' the word 'Lord' is the *tenor* (the metaphor's underlying subject) and the *vehicle* is 'shepherd' (the mode in which it is expressed). Metaphoric meaning is created when the two different meanings (tenor and vehicle) come together in a single form. Richards says,

> when we use a metaphor we have two thoughts of different things active together and supported by a single word, or phrase, whose meaning is resultant of their interaction...fundamentally it [metaphor] is a borrowing between and intercourse of *thoughts*, a transaction between contexts. *Thought* is metaphoric, and proceeds by comparison, and the metaphors of language derive therefrom.[72]

Black acknowledged his indebtedness to the work of Richards but took issue with him in some significant ways and identified his theory of metaphor as the *interactive* view. In an attempt to try to further clarify and understand metaphor, Black introduced a different terminology from Richards': *focus* and *frame*. Metaphor is an 'expression in which *some* words are used metaphorically while the remainder are

---

[70] Soskice (1985) 38-43.
[71] Sockice (1985) 43-51. The 'interanimation' theory is Soskice's theory of metaphor.
[72] Richards (1936) 93-94, his emphasis.

used non-metaphorically.'[73] The words that are used metaphorically belong to the *focus* and they occur in the literal *frame*, which is the rest of the sentence. These two subjects create an interactive dimension between focus and frame that results in a new meaning. In Black's understanding of metaphor, two themes surface again and again: 1) something new is created when a metaphor is understood, and 2) metaphors give us different ways of viewing the world. For Black the emergence of 'something new' is pivotal in his understanding of metaphor. Soskice notes,

> ...while the interaction view of metaphor has met with considerable general acceptance, and 'Metaphor' [the article in Black (1979)] has indeed come to be regarded as a seminal article, the terminology that Black uses there to describe metaphor has attracted criticism. The notion of 'interaction' is after all itself metaphorical and requires some explication, as does talk of the metaphorical 'focus' and 'frame', and also the notion that metaphor, like a 'piece of heavily smoked glass on which certain lines have been left clear' acts as a 'filter' or 'screen'.[74]

Besides these issues the real problem, according to Soskice, is Black's insistence on the fact that each metaphor has two distinct subjects. For Soskice, the two subjects result not in an interaction theory but simply in another comparison theory.[75]

The theory presented by Soskice is the *interanimation* theory.[76] Her thesis is that metaphor is a linguistic phenomenon, an interanimation of terms, clarified by context and should be fully cognitive. 'Metaphor is a speaking of one thing in terms which are seen as suggestive of another.'[77] Also, metaphor should be capable of saying that which may be said in no other way than by metaphor. She does not claim that her own theory of 'interanimation' will meet all that an ideal theory of metaphor should encompass, but she identifies the different elements a theory of metaphor might

---

[73] Black (1979) 27, his emphasis.
[74] Soskice (1985) 41.
[75] Soskice (1985) 43.
[76] Sockice (1985) 43-51.
[77] Sockice (1985) 49.

include:[78] 1) Metaphor is neither a simple substitution for literal speech nor is it strictly emotive but should be capable of saying that which could not be said in any other way. 2) Metaphor should be fully cognitive and able to give us 'two ideas for one,' and yet at the same time not just become a simple comparison theory. These first two points are basic. 3) If possible, metaphor theory should discuss the speaker's intention and the hearer's reception of it. As alluded to above, the hearer should be able to discern and recognize that the speaker is speaking metaphorically. 4) Finally, a discussion of metaphor would involve the consideration not only of what is said, but also of the context, linguistically and otherwise, in which it is said. This would involve an understanding of the beliefs and patterns of inference on the part of both the hearer and speaker. As Soskice says, 'In particular, we wish to show how metaphors can be cognitively unique, that is, how without being mere comparison they can give us "two ideas for one"'.[79]

Soskice also finds the work of I.A. Richards seminal. The term she uses to describe her own position, *interanimation, is* a term used by Richards in his discussion of metaphor. Soskice believes that Richards' account of metaphor continues to provide the most satisfactory way forward. While his approach needs some terminological refinements, which she provides, she suggests that we 'allow by a principle of historical charity' that, with the terminological adjustments, his argument has merit and should be taken seriously.[80]

---

[78] Soskice (1985) 44.
[79] Soskice (1985) 44.
[80] Soskice (1985) 44-45.

Richards also establishes that meaning is determined by complete utterances and contexts rather than by individual words in isolation. His next move is then to emphasize that metaphor is 'two thoughts of different things active together'[81] and this assures that his theory of metaphor is not a mere shifting of words or a substitution of terms, which is often a dilemma in any theory of metaphor. The way he explains this is in his use of *tenor*, which is the underlying subject of the metaphor and *vehicle*, that which presents the *tenor*. Richards' illustration of this is very helpful:

> A stubborn and unconquerable flame
> Creeps in his veins and drinks the streams of life.

The *tenor* is the idea of the fever from which the man is suffering, and the *vehicle* for it is the description of the flame. Soskice's comment on this illustration emphasizes that she thinks it is important that metaphor is more than just two *terms*, 'Note that in this passage the *fever is never explicitly mentioned,* hence Richards' suggestion that it is thoughts and not words which are active together, although the thoughts are of course bound up with the words.'[82] This last point should be emphasized because it illustrates one of the basic arguments of the interanimation view concerning the cognitive nature of metaphor.

This allows Richards to speak of two parts of the metaphor, *tenor* and *vehicle*, without introducing the idea of two distinct subjects.[83] The advantage of Richards' view, from Soskice's perspective, is that a metaphor has only one subject, which *tenor* and *vehicle* together can describe and picture; hence, Richards is able to concentrate on the words and the *interanimation* of words. Yet, as the illustration above clarifies,

---

[81] Richards (1936) 93.
[82] Soskice (1985) 45-46, her emphasis.
[83] As noted above, the idea that a metaphor has two subjects is one of Soskice's primary criticisms of Black's interactive theory. Black's insistence that a metaphor has two distinct subjects is according to Soskice 'responsible for most of the serious inconsistencies of Black's theory.' Also, according to Soskice, this allows Black's theory to be vulnerable to drifting toward a 'comparison' view that he himself had criticized earlier. Soskice (1985) 47. Cf. also 41, 45, 49.

Richards' even more subtle point is that *tenor* and *vehicle* do not need to be two *terms,* metaphor is the interanimation of words and thoughts. 'The content, the full meaning of the metaphor, results from the complete unit of tenor and vehicle...The metaphor and its meaning (it is artificial to separate them) are the unique product of the whole...[Therefore], a metaphor is genuinely creative and says something that can be said adequately in no other way, not as an ornament to what we already know but as an embodiment of a new insight.'[84]

Soskice has defined metaphor 'as a speaking about one thing in terms suggestive of another',[85] and she maintains that metaphor, properly speaking is a linguistic phenomenon, 'an interanimation of terms', but she also maintains an interactive dimension, since metaphor involves at least two different networks of associations. This she does through employing Richards' categories of *tenor* and *vehicle.*[86] Soskice's explanation of Richards' terminology and its ramifications for her theory of metaphor is very helpful. It is helpful because metaphor as a linguistic phenomenon is not to be interpreted in isolation but as a complete utterance in light of the surrounding contexts. Metaphor has the capacity to say something genuinely creative that cannot be said adequately in any other way. It is more than mere description or comparison but in its cognitive capacity can facilitate new insight. This will be explored further below as it applies to appreciation and interpretation of biblical metaphors.

As a transition to the *cognitive* approaches, the contribution of Eva Kittay[87] will help to further clarify both the basic features of the interactionist position and also

---

[84] Soskice (1985) 48.
[85] Soskice (1985) 15, 49.
[86] Soskice (1985) 49.
[87] Kittay (1987).

illustrate one more nuanced approach among the *interactionists*. Kittay will also emphasize metaphor's cognitive force as well as its linguistic structure.[88] She begins by identifying six elements of the *interactionism*. They are summarized as follows:[89]

(1) That metaphors are sentences, not isolated words.
(2) That a metaphor consists of two components.
(3) That there is a tension between these two components.
(4) That these components need to be understood as systems.
(5) That the meaning of a metaphor arises from an interplay of these components.
(6) That the meaning of metaphor is irreducible and cognitive.

She notes that the first four statements point to the structure of metaphor (the linguistic). The last two pertain to the interpretation of metaphor (the cognitive). Kittay discusses and elaborates each of these statements[90] in order to describe her position, which she calls the *perspectival* theory.

> Since *perspectival* implies a subject who observes from a stance, we can say that metaphor provides the linguistic realization for the cognitive activity by which a language speaker makes use of one linguistically articulated domain to gain an understanding of another experiential or conceptual domain, and similarly, by which a hearer grasps such an understanding.[91]

Kittay uses the term *perspective* to argue her position: 1) Perspective clarifies the first point above, that metaphors are understood in a certain context and not as isolated words. She notes, with others that, 'metaphors involve some sort of rule-breaking' in the sense that metaphor breaks certain ordinary semantic rules of language by combining incongruous concepts and terms, not in an arbitrary way but in ways that are specifiable rather than mistakes.[92] 2) Perspective is a more precise way, according

---

[88] Kittay (1987) 15. 'Concepts, as I understand them, are not free-floating, but emerge from the articulation of a domain by a set of contrasts and affinities available in an expressive medium. Without an expressive medium we most likely should not be able to form metaphors or even think metaphorically'.
[89] Kittay (1987) 22-23.
[90] Kittay (1987) 23-39.
[91] Kittay (1987) 14.
[92] Kittay (1987) 24. Her way of speaking about the literal and the metaphorical is to make a 'distinction between first-order meaning, that is, the literal and conventional senses of an utterance'...and 'second-order meaning which is metaphorical meaning'.

to her theory, to understand the interaction that occurs between what Richards called *tenor* and *vehicle*. Kittay chooses to 'retain *vehicle* with its suggestion of transport, to denote the focal term—that is, the label itself *and* the content that label conveys literally.'[93] The second content is called *topic*. '*Topic* suggests not an expression in a text, but rather what a text is speaking about.'[94] It is important to note that it is not the topic alone that is the meaning of the metaphor but it is both the vehicle and topic together, though incongruous, in a given context that creates a conceptual and contextual discourse. This brings into view the 'double semantic relationship' of metaphor.[95] 3) Perspective helps explicate this double semantic content of the tension that exists between the two components of vehicle and topic. The perspectival nature of metaphor shows 'that one component of the metaphor can be used as a way of organizing or conceptualizing the other. The meaning of the metaphor is the result of the perspectival juxtaposing of two ideas.'[96] 4) Kittay modifies Black's understanding of how the components are understood as systems in two ways: 'first, the systems are not "associated commonplaces" but *semantic fields*; secondly, both the vehicle and the topic belong to systems, not only the vehicle (the subsidiary subject).'[97] 5) The perspectival theory says that the meaning of a metaphor results from the interplay of the meaning between the field of the vehicle and the field of the topic. 'More precisely, in metaphor what is transferred are the relations which pertain within one semantic field to a second, distinct content domain. That, in short, is how I characterize metaphor.'[98] 6) Kittay assumes with other theorists[99] that metaphor is

---

[93] Kittay (1987) 26. Her emphasis.
[94] Kittay (1987) 26. Her emphasis.
[95] Kittay (1987) 26. The phrase, 'double semantic relationship' is from Henle (1981).
[96] Kittay (1987) 29.
[97] Kittay (1987) 30. This is Kittay's modification of Black's 'two distinct subjects.'
[98] Kittay (1987) 36.
[99] Kittay (1987) 14. As she says, 'From Richards to Lakoff and Johnson (1980)'.

conceptual and that many of our actions are based on metaphorical conceptions. One of the significant aspects of metaphor is not only its capacity to provide new information, but rather to (re)conceptualize the information that is already available to us. 'Information which is not articulated and conceptualized is of little cognitive importance. Metaphor is a primary way in which we accommodate and assimilate information and experience to our conceptual organization of the world.'[100]

3.1.2.4 Cognitive Approaches

The fourth approach to metaphor is the *cognitive* approach. This approach says that metaphor is first and foremost a phenomenon of thought and mental representation rather than a linguistic expression. It was developed in the early nineteen-eighties and is associated with George Lakoff, Mark Johnson, and others.[101] Lakoff and Johnson's theorizing is basic to any discussion of the cognitive theory of metaphor.[102] One of the fundamental tenets of the cognitive theory is that metaphor is not a figure of speech, but rather a figure of thought. Some theorists have classified the cognitive theory as one more approach to be included among the *interactionist* theories.[103] But it is argued by those holding this position[104] that while the *cognitive* view shares some basic ideas with *interactionism,* the emphasis is on the characterization of metaphor as a conceptual phenomenon. Thus, it is understood to be a new and fourth approach to metaphor theory.

---

[100] Kittay (1987) 39.
[101] Boeve and Feyaerts (1999) chs 10-14. Feyaerts (2002); Johnson (1981); Kovecses (2002); Lakoff (1993) Lakoff and Johnson (1981); MacCormac (1985); Ortony (1979, rev. ed. 1993); Reddy (1993); Van Hecke (2000, 2001).
[102] Lakoff (1993) 203-204.
[103] E.g. Maier (1999); Kovecses (2002); Lakoff (1993).
[104] Boeve and Feyaerts (1999); Kovecses (2002); Lakoff (1993); Van Hecke (2000, 2001).

Initially, three claims can be emphasized in regard to metaphor's cognitive functionality.[105] The first claim is 'the *explanatory force* of metaphor, meaning that some parts of our conceptual system can only be understood and structured (*disclosed*) through projection of coherent patterns of reasoning out of other knowledge domains.'[106] This is considered prominent by cognitivists. Metaphor is understood to be indispensable and unavoidable in the process of any form of dynamic reasoning. Second, metaphor has 'an enormous *creative power*'.[107] This has similarities with the interactionist theory in that the cognitive approach also upholds the theory that new meanings and models of thought are created in the use of metaphors.[108] The third claim of cognitive functionality has to do with 'the observation that a single event, action, state or property can be construed in many different (metaphoric) ways, thus equally highlighting different aspects of the *explanadum* (focusing function).'[109] Again, while not exactly the same, this also mimics Black's *focus/frame* description of the function of metaphor. Black's *frame*, usually the sentence in which the metaphor is found, becomes for the cognitivists the larger and more general *conceptual domain.*

As indicated above, I have chosen to respect the arguments of the cognitive theorists who argue that their approach to metaphor be considered a separate theory from *interactionism.* Consequently it will be discussed on its own terms.[110] The basic claims of this theory are as follows.[111] First, metaphor is a property of concepts, and not of words. Metaphor is not in the first place a figure of speech, but rather a figure of

---

[105] Boeve and Feyaerts (1999) 9.
[106] Boeve and Feyaerts (1999) 9, their emphasis.
[107] Boeve and Feyaerts (1999) 9, their emphasis.
[108] Cf. The remark above about Soskice's use of Richards. Also, Cf. Ricoeur (1976), 53, 'Tension metaphors are not translatable because they create their meaning.... A metaphor, in short, tells us something new about reality'.
[109] Boeve and Feyaerts (1999) 10, their emphasis. Cf. Kovecses (2002) 32-36.
[110] Boeve and Feyaerts (1999) 9.
[111] Lakeoff and Johnson (1981); Lakoff (1993) 202-204; Kovecses (2002) 2-6.

thought. To quote Lakoff and Johnson, 'Metaphors as linguistic expressions are possible because there are metaphors in a person's conceptual system.'[112] A linguistic metaphor like 'The Lord is my shepherd' is only possible because people were and are able to *conceptualize* or mentally structure God as a shepherd. 'In short, the locus of metaphor is not in language at all, but in the way we conceptualize one mental domain in terms of another. The general theory of metaphor is given by characterizing such cross-domain mappings.'[113]

Second, in contrast to the classical understanding of metaphor as mere ornamentation or a simple comparison, Lakoff and Johnson say, *'The essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another.'*[114] Concepts are understood metaphorically and experienced metaphorically and then language is metaphorically structured to communicate these concepts in a richer and more complex fashion. They are more than mere ornamentation or simple comparison.

As the definition of metaphor above indicates, metaphor is not a single word or thought, but the interaction between at least two elements. The word *interaction* is often used, but it is used in relation to concepts, understanding, actions and experiences that are metaphorically structured. Lakoff uses the conceptual metaphor of 'Love is a Journey'.[115] Two domains are identified in the conceptual metaphor, the experience of love and the very different domain, the experience of journeys. 'More technically, the metaphor can be understood as a mapping (in the mathematical sense) from a source domain (in this case, journeys) to a target domain (in this case, love).'[116]

---

[112] Lakeoff and Johnson (1981) 6.
[113] Lakof (1993) 203.
[114] Lakoff and Johnson (1981) 5. Their emphasis.
[115] Lakoff (1993)206.e.g.Look *how far we've come.* It's been a *long, bumpy road.* We can't *turn back now.*
[116] Lakoff (1993) 206-207.

> As a linguist and a cognitive scientist, I ask two commonplace questions: Is there a general principle governing how these linguistic expressions about journeys are used to characterize love? Is there a general principle governing how our patterns of inference about journeys are used to reason about love when expressions such as these are used?
>
> The answer to both is yes. Indeed, there is a single general principle that answers both questions, but it is a general principle that is neither part of the grammar of English, nor the English lexicon. Rather, it is part of the conceptual system underlying English. It is a principle for understanding the domain of love in terms of the domain of journeys.[117]

Typically the form is 'Target-Domain is Source-Domain' or 'Target-Domain as Source-Domain.' The word *shepherd*--or its corresponding concept--in itself does not constitute a metaphor; it is only in the interaction between two domains (e.g. the Lord and shepherd) that a metaphor arises.

The cognitive theorists also point to the work of I. A. Richards as a precursor to their view. They note for example Richards' comment, 'In the simplest formulation, when we use metaphor we have two thoughts of different things active together and supported by a single word, or phrase, whose meaning is the resultant of their interaction.'[118] They emphasize the '*two thoughts* of different things *active together*.'

Third, ordinary people, in everyday speech, use metaphor. It is not used only by such special, talented people as Aristotle and Quintillian as the classical approach seemed to imply. '[M]etaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature.'[119] The illustration used is the conceptual metaphor 'Argument is War.'

> ARGUMENT IS WAR
> Your claims are *indefensible.*
> He *attacked every weak point* in my argument.
> His criticisms were *right on target.*

---

[117] Lakoff (1993) 206.
[118] Richards (1936) 93.
[119] Lakoff and Johnson (1981) 3.

> I *demolished* his argument.
> I've never *won* an argument with him.
> You disagree? Okay, *shoot!*
> If you use that *strategy*, he'll *wipe you out.*
> He *shot down* all my arguments.[120]

Argument is here discussed in light of the concept of war. Note too that this is a very ordinary way of speaking about different aspects of an argument, at least in North American culture in 1980. They propose that some of the conventional ways people speak about arguments presuppose an underlying cognitive metaphor that normally most people are not even consciously aware of. Ordinary life is lived, experienced and even shaped by cognitive metaphors.

This leads to a fourth observation: metaphor is culturally conditioned. In regard to the illustration above, note that 'the ARGUMENT IS WAR metaphor is one that we live by in this culture; it structures the action we perform in arguing.'[121] Imagine, by way of contrast, a culture where argument is viewed not as war but as a dance. The goal is then not 'winning' but performing the dance in such a way that there is balance and cooperation leading to a kind of harmony that is aesthetically pleasing.[122] The fundamental values of a culture will be consistent with the metaphorical structure of a culture's most fundamental concepts.[123] 'In general, which values are given priority is partly a matter of the subculture one lives in and partly a

---

[120] Lakoff and Johnson (1981) 4.
[121] Lakoff and Johnson (1981) 4.
[122] Lakoff and Johnson (1981) 5-9. They also use the metaphorical concept of 'Time is Money.' A few illustrations: 'You're *wasting* my time. How do you *spend* your time? I've *invested* a lot of time in her. You need to *budget* your time... Time in our culture is a valuable commodity.' But this is a culturally (and we might add historically) conditioned way to conceptualize time, 'This isn't a necessary way for human beings to conceptualize time; it is tied to our culture. There are cultures where time is none of these things'.
[123] Lakoff and Johnson (1981).

matter of personal values. The various subcultures of a mainstream culture share basic values but give them different priorities.'[124]

Fifth, the cognitive approach understands the relationship between the linguistic expression of a metaphor and its conceptual basis by proposing that the meaning of a word can only be understood against the background of a complete set of knowledge, beliefs, and intuitions. Metaphor always has a context. This background set is generally termed a *conceptual domain* in the *cognitive* theory.[125] The word *shepherd*, for example, can only be understood by someone who has at least a certain amount of knowledge of the conceptual domain of shepherds and sheep and/or pastoralism. The meaning of the word is established by its ability to designate one particular element in this domain, for example, that of the person who takes care of the animals. Therefore, each element of a linguistic metaphor is related to one or more conceptual domains. As noted above metaphor always consists of an interaction between two elements. Hence, a conceptual metaphor may now be defined as the interaction between two conceptual domains, Target-Domain and Source-Domain, an interaction in which one conceptual domain is restructured on the basis of what we know about another conceptual domain. In the metaphor, 'The Lord is my shepherd,' the domain of relations between God and humans is structured on the basis of what we know of the domain of pastoralism.

3.1.3 The Approach to Metaphor in this Thesis

The basic approach of this thesis is the *interanimation/perspectival* approach. The primary reason for this is to locate metaphor in the world of semantics. But metaphor, as the review shows, is a rich and complex idea. It will be argued that while

---

[124] Lakoff and Johnson (1981) 23.
[125] Lakoff (1993) 231.

metaphors are semantic, they have cognitive force or significance. The tendency to isolate a theory of metaphor--whether from the domain of semantics as a linguistic phenomenon or exclusively from the perspective of pragmatics and language use or exclusively as a phenomenon of thought--seems to restrict the potential of metaphor. The following is an attempt to appropriate a number of points using the general *interactionist/incrementalist* theory, specifically the *interanimation* and the *perspectival* approaches.

3.1.3.1 An Interanimation/Perspectival Approach

The Richards/Soskice approach (*interanimation*) and Kittay's approach (*perspectival*) attempt legitimately to take into account the differing concerns of a theory of metaphor without mutually excluding or dismissing the importance of either the linguistic or the cognitive dimension. This is the approach adopted in the thesis. Granted, from a purely *cognitivist* position, the priority given by Richards/Soskice to the linguistic dimension is not acceptable.[126] Yet, Kittay's contributions can be helpful in bridging the gap between the linguistic importance of metaphor and its cognitive force.

Often, it seems, metaphor has been approached in biblical studies as only a means to an end: the only thing really important about metaphor is how it can be translated into the *literal truth* it teaches. Approached in this way, metaphor is again reduced to pragmatics, substitution, comparison or simply to ornamentation. The potential dynamic and creative possibilities of metaphor have often been overlooked. An appreciation of Richards/Soskice's *interanimation* and Kittay's *perspectival* approach to metaphor as it applies to biblical studies has the possibility of opening up

[126] It should be recalled that the cognitivists appeal to Richards in support of their position and the interactionist/incrementalists discuss the cognitive dimension of metaphor. Cf. above and Soskice (1985) 53, 'The metaphor is cognitively unique'.

new insights into biblical metaphor and its implications. This is the primary understanding of metaphor used in this thesis, and how it will be employed will now be explored.[127]

The first major observation of an *interanimation/perspectival* theory of metaphor is that metaphor is not the thing itself. Metaphor depicts and potentially creates new meaning, but it does not define. Instead, remaining open-ended, it is 'figurative speech which is reality depicting without claiming to be directly descriptive.'[128] It was noted at the beginning of this chapter that metaphorical ways of speaking of God are a human way of saying something that cannot be adequately expressed through literal description alone. It was assumed that since the subject matter is God, metaphorical language is essential. This is because God cannot be fully comprehended and so metaphor helps to comprehend God and to avoid the idolatry of limiting descriptions of God. Metaphorical language is a tool which allows humankind to articulate differing perceptions of God.

At this point a further clarification concerning metaphorical language and literal statements about God is in order. Two approaches currently dominate biblical scholarship in regard to this question. One is based on subject matter and the other is based on language usage.[129]

---

[127] Though somewhat clumsy terminology, this will be referred to as an interanimation/perspectival theory.

[128] Soskice (1985) 144, 148 'Our concern is with conceptual possibility rather than proof, and with a demonstration that we may justly claim to speak of God without claiming to define him, and to do so by means of metaphor.'

[129] These two are not the only ways to deal with this issue but they are probably two of the most common. The reality is that many biblical scholars give little or no systematic thought to what metaphor is or how metaphor functions. Also, I do not want to dichotomize these two approaches too much because it seems to me that each has something to offer.

The *subject-matter* approach would seem to be the more common of the two and has a long history.[130] It argues that metaphor is basic to any attempt to speak of God because literal expressions could not describe the Divine in a direct manner.[131] This perspective could be identified with *interanimation/perspectival* theory. Many would argue that if it were not for metaphorical language, very little could be said of God.[132] Walter Brueggemann has an extended discussion on this topic and he writes,

> The images and metaphors used to speak about Yahweh will be regularly misunderstood and distorted into idolatry unless it is endlessly remembered that the claim of the noun is always held loosely, in light of the metaphorical character of the noun and the elusive quality of the Subject.[133]

Brueggemann, among many, focuses on the 'elusive quality of the Subject' pointing out that metaphorical expressions are part of 'the durable testimony' learned from biblical literature.

Much earlier, Ian Ramsey argued that metaphorical language about God could be clustered under three identifiable categories. [134] The three categories are: 1) Phrases which spread from a family model: father, mother, husband and friend.[135] 2) Terms of men's work, crafts and professions: shepherd, farmer, dairymaid, fuller or laundress,

---

[130] E.g. Ramsey (1971) 15-18. He gives a sampling of quotations from Clement of Alexandria to John of Damascus. He concludes the chapter, 'The language, therefore, that we have been quoting, is not that of intellectual agnosticism, but of religious awe—awe intensified not by the thought of God's remoteness, but by the conviction and experience of His intimate nearness to men'.

[131] To note only a few: von Rad (1962) 1:215; McFague (1982, 1987); Banks (1992); Brueggemann (1997) 70-71, 230ff.

[132]One example is Jüngel, (1989) esp. 58–71, 'The language of faith is metaphorical through and through. "God" is a meaningful word only in the context of metaphorical speech, and immediately becomes meaningless if the *connexio verborum* (combination of words) is not understood metaphorically.'

[133] Brueggemann (1997) 232-233. Cf. esp. Chapter 6. He identifies Yahweh as Judge, King, Warrior, Father calling these 'Metaphors of Governance' and Yahweh as Artist, Healer, Gardener-Vinedresser, Mother and Shepherd as 'Metaphors of Sustenance'.

[134] Ramsey (1974a) 120-140. Ramsey prefers the word 'model' rather than image or metaphor 'because, by virtue of its wider use in contemporary philosophical discussion, it carries with it natural logical overtones and takes us at once into a logical context.'120. Cf. Ramsey (1964) Ch. 3 for the relation between model and metaphor. For Ramsey's discussion of, among others, Richards and Black cf. Ramsey (1971) 168-190.

[135] Ramsey (1974a) 121.

builder, potter, fisherman, tradesman, physician, teacher and scribe, nurse and metal worker.[136] 3) Pictures from a national setting: king, warrior and judge.[137] The question of whether Ramsey is accurate in identifying the major categories of metaphors for God is not the primary point for us. The point under consideration is how this forms the empirical basis for descriptions of God. For Ramsey, because God is the subject-matter: 'here is theological language directly related,..."to the world of experience"; here are religious situations linked with "secular" situations; here is talk about God which has plain links with the discourse of ordinary life.'[138] The purpose in using Brueggemann and Ramsey is not to argue for or against their respective positions but simply to use them as representatives of the long history of the subject-matter approach concerning the necessity of metaphorical language when speaking of God. [139]

The second approach concerning metaphorical language and literal statements about God in biblical studies is based on language usage. It is associated with the cognitive theory of metaphor and its proponents.[140] As noted in the discussion above, metaphor arises from our cognitive structure, that is, we think metaphorically regardless of language, culture or context. Thus, we speak of God metaphorically because we are built to think metaphorically. The cognitive theory when understood in this way sounds deterministic. With this theory in place we should expect to find metaphors everywhere and might even be surprised should they be absent.

---

[136] Ramsey (1974a) 121-122.
[137] Ramsey (1974a) 122-123.
[138] Ramsey (1974a) 123.
[139] On Ramsey Cf. Soskice (1985) 103ff, 145-148, 153 and McFague (1982) 122-125, 131-132.
[140] In regard to biblical studies cf. esp. Boeve and Feyaerts (1999); Feyaerts (2002); Van Hecke (2000, 2001).

The primary perspective of the thesis concerning metaphorical language about God is the 'subject-matter' approach. Both approaches ('subject-matter' or 'language usage') share the common conviction that God metaphors are necessary. In the case of 'subject-matter', it is the nature of the subject matter, namely God, who lies beyond full description and thus metaphorical language is necessary. With the 'language usage' approach, it is because of the way we *think* that metaphorical language is necessary. According to this approach, it is our cognitive condition that necessitates speech via metaphorical images. The overlap of both approaches is that God cannot be spoken about or understood directly. Therefore, we must speak of God indirectly and with metaphors.

Before leaving this first point it is important to reiterate that metaphor brings together two normally incompatible or incongruous ideas. Metaphor has the character of *is* and *is not* because while an assertion is made, it is not a definition.[141] So for example in the phrase, 'Yahweh *is* a shepherd,' the noun is the metaphor. Yet, at the same time, the noun *is not* the metaphor, 'Yahweh *is not* a shepherd.' One can say that the metaphor *is* and *is not.* The literal reference to the shepherd is suspended and the metaphorical reference is a way of relating to and living with Yahweh in the world and this way is available to us through the metaphor of shepherding. Therefore, what is said is kept open-ended in the awareness that the noun, in this case *Yahweh*, resists comprehensive evocative and associative description. At the same time, the metaphor creates the association of the qualities of a shepherd with Yahweh.

---

[141] This is the language of Ricoeur (1977) 255, 'The paradox consists in the fact that there is no other way to do justice to the notion of metaphorical truth than to include the critical incision of the (literal) 'is not' within the ontological vehemence of the (metaphorical) 'is'. In doing so, the thesis merely draws the most extreme consequence of the theory of tension'.

I conclude this first point in regard to an *interanimation/perspectival* approach to metaphor by noting that metaphor as a figure of speech attempts to depict the subject matter (God) in a reality-depicting fashion but does not claim to be definitive or overly descriptive and thereby remains open-ended.

A second point concerning the *interanimation/perspectival* approach emphasizes that metaphor originates in language use and not some 'sort of mental event.'[142] This divides the cognitive theorists from the more general interactional theorists. The one places metaphor in the world of ideas, the latter in the world of language. The debate concerning whether metaphor is essentially conceptual or linguistic will undoubtedly continue, but both understandings of metaphor can be helpful. With Soskice, a figure of speech metaphor is used to express meaning. With the cognitive approach, metaphor is the device that enables people to perceive their experience and how they think about the world.

It is only through some representational system that the structure of metaphor can be understood and language is one of the most elaborate and basic representational systems we have as human beings. It therefore seems best to approach the explanation of metaphor first linguistically. This proposal will do most to advance our understanding of the conceptual and cognitive significance of metaphor.[143] Language expresses ideas. Metaphor 'prompts us' into cognitive associations, recognitions and comparisons, but it also prompts us in regard to linguistic associations as well.[144]

---

[142] Soskice (1985) 18; Kittay (1987) 15. This is the basic presupposition that distinguishes it from the cognitive approaches.
[143] Kittay (1987) 15, 'I aim to understand the cognitive force of metaphor through the elucidation of metaphoric meaning.'
[144] Soskice (1985) 18.

In the third point I want to combine several points of the *interanimation/ perspectival* approach because they relate to each other in regard to the way metaphor functions. 1) Metaphor is identified by its function, not its form. 'Metaphor displays no one syntactic form because the criteria by which it is distinguished are not merely syntactic, but semantic and pragmatic as well.'[145] 2) Metaphor is not limited to a term or phrase but becomes apparent in the wider context in which it occurs.[146] The meaning of the metaphor is not determined because the terms are in some way being 'used metaphorically' or have special 'metaphorical meanings,' but rather as the meaning of the complete utterance is construed in its context of uttering.[147] Richards/Sokice describe this as the *interanimation* between the *tenor*, the underlying subject of the metaphor, and the *vehicle* of the metaphor. As noted above, Kittay chooses to change the language, so the *tenor* becomes the *topic*. But both emphasize (and the thesis will do the same) that it is in the tension, interaction, and interanimation between both *tenor/topic* and *vehicle* that the metaphor is created.[148] Kittay describes the context of the metaphor by generalizing the language of *focus* and *frame*.[149] The focus is the two components of *tenor/topic* and *vehicle* and the *frame* is the larger context of the metaphor.

The combination of these points in the *interanimation/perspectival* approach emphasizes that metaphors are *contextually conditioned*; that context includes at least the semantic and cultural contexts; and that conditioning impacts the construction, reception, and interpretation of metaphor.

---

[145] Soskice (1985) 19.
[146] Ricoeur (1977) 44, 48-51 speaks of the 'tyranny of the word.' The primacy of the sentence is a constant theme for Ricoeur but Soskice's theory encourages an even wider look at the context and to avoid even the 'tyranny of the sentence'.
[147] Soskice (1985) 53.
[148] Soskice (1985) 47-48. Kittay (1987) 25-26.
[149] Black limited the 'focus and frame' to the sentence. Cf. Kittay (1987) 65, n.21, 'In keeping with my rejection of the sentence as the metaphorical unit, I am generalizing the notion of focus and frame'.

This then leads to the fourth point. Metaphor is cognitive and creates new meaning. It says something that cannot be said any other way. It gives us 'two ideas for one.'[150] Metaphor creates a plurality of associative networks. The associative network of ideas that is created is contextually conditioned, sometimes producing a greater constellation of connections, sometimes fewer. This creative capacity is related to how dynamic or vital the metaphor is, so we speak of living metaphors or dead metaphors. When a metaphor has become commonplace, its initial constellation of connections becomes either almost completely lost or difficult to recall.[151] An originally vital metaphor draws upon an underlying model or models that the hearer/reader is familiar with from experience; this then potentially creates a network of ideas that enables them to 'go on' to the richness of metaphorical description.[152]

What I have attempted to do in the preceding is to clarify how the thesis approaches the theory of metaphor. I have chosen an interanimation/pespectival approach and have described how Richards/Soskice and Kittay have been helpful in clarifying a working theory of metaphor. In thinking of metaphor, it is important to keep the four major points in mind. Now, we turn to explore metaphor analysis.

---

[150] Soskice (1985) 44, 48.

[151] The tension between the two components, to use Kittay's way of describing it, ceases to exist in a dead metaphor and the metaphor is easily paraphrased; e.g. 'the heart of the matter' is readily paraphrased as 'the center of the issue.' Cf. Soskice (1985) 71-83.

[152] Soskice (1985) 50-51, 55. 'Talk based on models will be metaphorical, so model and metaphor, though different categories are not to be–as frequently they are by theologians—equated; the latter is what we have when we speak on the basis of the former.' Cf. McFague (1982) 23. 'In the continuum of religious language from primary, imagistic to secondary, conceptual, a form emerges which is a mixed type: *the model*. The simplest way to define a model is as a dominant metaphor, a metaphor with staying power.... For our preliminary purposes, however, the main point is that models are a further step along the route from metaphorical to conceptual language'. McFague (1987) 194 says her view is close to Ricoeur. Cf. Ricoeur (1977) 239-246.

3.1.3.2 Metaphor Analysis

A brief summary of metaphor analysis begins by recognizing the use of the incongruous terms identified as the *tenor/topic* and *vehicle*, for example, 'The Lord (*tenor/topic*) is my shepherd (*vehicle*).' The *focus* is both *topic* and *vehicle* together and the *frame* is the context of the metaphor. The scope of the *frame* of a metaphor is considered by distinguishing between what may be called *established* metaphor and *extended* metaphor.[153] The distinction between how these two ways of metaphor function will now be explored.

3.1.3.2.1 'Established' Metaphor

The metaphor is established as soon as the hearer/reader understands that one thing is being spoken of in terms suggestive of another. This may be as brief as a simple phrase or several phrases that relate to each other to establish a metaphor. Initially, the question is whether there are sufficient semantic criteria to enable one to recognize the metaphor without artificially imposing some syntactic form on the phrase or sentence. An important point that will be taken into account here is to initially consider the metaphor as is. Rather than immediately stripping the metaphor of its metaphorical language and only looking for the *literal meaning* or the *underlying truth*, each metaphor will be considered for its potentiality and what it might be saying that can only be said by metaphor. Then the full context of the metaphorical utterance will be considered. While syntax and form will be considered in due fashion, the semantic function and potential richness of the metaphor will also be taken into account.

This is related to appreciating the close connection between metaphor and models in the *interanimation/perspectival* theory.[154] Soskice describes the close linkage between

[153] Soskice (1985) 22-23. Kittay (1987) speaks of 'isolated' and 'extended' metaphors.

the two in this way: 'when we use a model, we regard one thing or state of affairs in terms of another, and when we use a metaphor, we speak of one thing or state of affairs in language suggestive of another.'[155]

It is assumed in this thesis that metaphor is used to clarify and *create* potential meaning by engaging the hearer/reader in understanding the meaning of a text and not used to obscure or confuse the meaning. We take as a basic presupposition that the biblical writers generally and Matthew specifically want their hearers/readers to appreciate and embrace any metaphorical uses or allusions.

Questions that could be posed might include: How dominant is this metaphor for the writer? How important is this metaphor for the community to which it is meant to speak? That is, is the shepherd/sheep metaphor a dominant metaphor for the author and/or the community or is it a 'marginal' metaphor? What possible cognitive associations are made? For example the shepherd metaphor might include such associations as care, guidance, protection, physical nurture, healing, feeding, help, provision, deliverance. Are the associations likely to be positive or negative in light of the tradition (the diachronic issues)?[156] Are the associations likely to be positive or negative in light of the contemporary setting (synchronic issues)?[157] In regard to the shepherd/sheep metaphor the intertextuality of the text will also be explored and, when relevant, the network of texts to which it belongs will be analyzed. Is the metaphor

---

[154] Soskice (1985) 50, 'at a secondary level metaphorical construal is characterized by its reliance on an underlying model, or even on a number of such models, and that metaphor and model are indeed,...closely linked'.

[155] Soskice (1985) 50-51.

[156] Diachronic: Lit. "through time," denoting a historical perspective that focuses on underlying and interrelated processes governing a sequence of events over time. Elliott (1993) 128. The diachronic concern tracks the movement of the metaphor through the tradition and looks to evaluate the status or changes of the metaphor through time.

[157] Synchronic: Lit. "at the same time," denoting a holistic perspective on a (social) system and the interrelations of its several sectors (ecological, economic, social, political, cultural). Elliott (193) 135. The synchronic concern is to attempt to define specifically how the metaphor is currently understood or valued.

being re-interpreted or given new meaning? Is it a dominant metaphor, or is it being diminished in some way? Has the metaphor even become negative or pejorative in its usage? There may be times when the metaphor would be expected to be used but it is absent. Is it possible to discern why? Is it still a vital or living metaphor? These questions may not have a definitive answer and are not all relevant in every context. But, to keep them in mind will be helpful in allowing the metaphor its full cognitive force.

The above questions will also be asked in an attempt to answer the very basic question concerning metaphor, 'Is this a root metaphor?' I am using 'root metaphor' to describe a metaphor that is basic, fundamental or central within the linguistic community, usually one among a possible handful of other metaphors that dominate and are central to the life/identity of the community.[158] It is a metaphor that because of its cognitive force and significance, the community has embraced the image as a 'root-metaphor' descriptive of the community? To use the subtitle of Kittay's book, the goal will be to discern the 'cognitive force and the linguistic structure' of the shepherd/sheep metaphor.

3.1.3.2.2 'Extended' Metaphor

Once a metaphor is established (that is, when the hearer/reader detects that one thing is being spoken of in terms suggestive of another), the metaphor may be extended until the length of our speaking makes us forget the 'thing' of which we speak.[159]

---

[158] McFague (1982) 28, 'a root-metaphor is the most basic assumption about the nature of the world or experience that we can make when we try to give a description of it. Each root-metaphor is a way of seeing "all that is" through a particular key concept. It is also thinking by models and, as is evident, even these root-metaphors are still metaphors....'

[159] Soskice (1985) 22-23.

Psalm 23 was alluded to as an illustration of the extended metaphor. One question in the psalm becomes, 'After the metaphor is established--'The Lord is my shepherd'--how far does the psalm extend the metaphor?' The Psalmist depicts relationship with *YHWH* by means of the common activities of the shepherd: provision of food and water (v 2), restoration and guidance (v 3), presence and protection (v 4). The shepherd metaphor extends to at least to this point in the psalm. The model of shepherding is supported by other metaphors in the psalm which are not to be taken literally. In addition, an *is not* dimension of the metaphor is also present: the Lord is not a shepherd and life with God is not really like being a sheep, and yet, this *is* the description of *YHWH* and his relation to the psalmist. The literal reference to the model of the shepherd is acknowledged and then suspended. The supporting metaphors function in the same fashion. Of course, at one level the supporting metaphors are also concrete and literal: green pastures, water, paths, walking, valley, rod and staff. But the established metaphor of the Lord as shepherd is extended through the supporting metaphors and together they create new meaning that is 'cognitively unique.'[160] Other relevant shepherd texts represent the extended metaphor and will be considered, for example: Jer 23, Ez 34, Zech 10-13.

In addition, there is also the use of extended metaphor through 'quotation, allusion and echo' in Matthew. To discern this, one might ask, Does Matthew want the reader/hearer not only to focus on the actual quote but also on the larger context where the quotation comes from?—does the use of the shepherd metaphor then encourage possible reflection on the person of Jesus that can only be accomplished by the use of the metaphor? An example of this is in Mt 2:6 in the story of the coming of the Magi, which is a quote, with some Matthean redaction, from Micah 5:2(1) and II Sam. 5:2.

[160] Soskice (1985) 53.

That it is a compound quote is generally agreed upon. But, it has often been asked why Matthew did not go on to quote the shepherd text in Micah 5:3-4, 'he shall stand and feed [shepherd: רָעָה] his flock in the strength of the LORD.'[161] In this case the primary text, Mt 2:6, offers the metaphor and then through intertextuality extends the metaphor through a constellation of ideas and connotations associated with the shepherd metaphor and derived from the texts quoted.[162]

3.2 Summary

My argument is that through the awareness of how metaphor functions and through the employment of metaphorical analysis, the semantic potential of the shepherd/sheep motif will be appreciated more fully. In sum, first metaphor is established by the larger context and is not limited to a word, phrase or sentence. The example, 'sheep without a shepherd' illustrates this, there is the need for a context to determine if it is a literal or metaphorical statement. Second, once a metaphor is established it may be a *simple* metaphor or it may be *extended* as in Psalm 23. Third, among the diverse approaches to how metaphors *function,* the *interanimation/perspectival* approach is the approach of the thesis. This approach locates metaphor in the world of semantics but at the same time recognizes that metaphor also has cognitive force and significance. In particular, several points concerning this approach are: 1) Metaphor is not the thing itself but it depicts reality without asserting that it is a comprehensive description and therefore potentially creates the possibility for new meaning. Metaphorical language allows us to speak of

[161] Davies and Allison 1:244 ask, 'Why does the evangelist not go on to quote the rest of Mic 5:2? Mention of one "whose origin is from of old, from ancient days" would have admirably suited the purposes reflected by the genealogy; and 5:3 ("until the time when she who is in travail has brought forth") would have been to the point coming after 1:18-25. Maybe the readers are supposed to fill in for themselves'.

[162] Kittay (1987) 90.

God and helps us avoid the idolatry of limiting descriptions of God. 2) Metaphor brings together two normally incompatible ideas, creating a tension between the *is* and the *is not* of the metaphor but again avoiding definition *per se* while allowing for an assertion. The example used was 'The Lord is my shepherd'. 3) While metaphor originates in language, it is identified by its function not its form. Metaphor is not determined because the terms are in some way 'metaphorical' or have special 'metaphorical meanings,' rather metaphor has meaning in the context of the complete utterance. 4) Finally, metaphor is understandable only when there is shared language and conceptual content. This indicates the need to do the linguistic and socio-historical exegetical work to appreciate the shepherd/sheep image.[163] This task of exegetical and socio-historical work will begin in Chapter Four.

[163] A word about the terminology used in this thesis. While it is acknowledged that there are important subtle, and sometimes not so subtle, distinctions between terms like metaphor, image, motif, theme, and idea, all these terms will be used generally as synonyms of each other throughout the thesis. This is purely a practical decision, because the redundant use of the term metaphor exclusively would become tedious and tiresome. It is recognized that along with the term 'model,' which I will distinguish from metaphor, there are other terms that are common to a discussion on metaphor. Two terms, for example, are symbol and analogy. 'Symbol' can be understood as a 'mixed' term as well, more like model; so, for example, the symbol of the cross is a physical (iconic) as well as linguistic symbol for Christianity. 'Analogy' is a form of argument or a type of relation, so e.g. the model train is an analogy of structure to full-scale train. These terms, along with 'model' we want to distinguish from metaphor and will not use them synonymously with metaphor. Yet, 'image' can also be distinguished from metaphor, especially when being used to specify mental events or visual representations. This term will be used more generally and will be used synonymously with metaphor because image is also a general term used for figures of speech. So, throughout this thesis we will use the term image along with those terms noted above as synonyms for metaphor. Cf. Soskice (1985) 55.

CHAPTER 4
SHEPHERDS AND SHEEP IN HISTORICAL CONTEXT

4.1 Ancient Near Eastern Background

One of the earliest occupations of humanity was the herding and shepherding of flocks. There is evidence that sheep were domesticated as early as 9000 B.C.E. in the area of northern Iraq.[1] It is out of the daily routine and rhythm of this life that the wide-ranging and multifaceted imagery of shepherd and flock emerged. In this chapter consideration will be given to this larger context of the shepherd/sheep metaphor by examining the ANE and Greece as well as the biblical tradition.[2]

4.1.1 The Realities that Inform the Shepherd/Sheep Metaphor

In order to understand and appreciate the meaning of the shepherd/sheep metaphor, it is important to consider first some of the realities of the nomadic shepherd and the animals they herded.[3]

In the biblical tradition, the shepherd is most often pictured as a man or a group of men responsible for the care and safety of sheep and goats. However, in a sense, every person in a biblical nomadic family was a shepherd, because all

---

[1] Köhler-Rollefson (1985) 937.

[2] This review will include only selected texts from Mesopotamia and Egypt. Yet, in regard to the biblical tradition, some attempt at thoroughness has been made towards appreciation of the literal understanding of the shepherd/sheep image.

[3] The following information concerning shepherd, sheep and goats is drawn from Beyreuther (1978) 3:564-569; Hopkins (1993) 200-211; Jeremias (1966) 6:485-502; Köhler-Rollefson (1985) 350, 937-938; Matthews and Benjamin (1993) 52-66; Mattingly (1985) 941-942; Morrison (1981) 257-296, (1983) 155-164; and Vancil *ABD* 5:1187-1190. Generally the terminology of social anthropology will be used. Cf. Galaty and Johnson (1990) 1-31; Bar-Yosef and Khazanov (1992) 1-6. *Pastoralism* is the general term describing the work of those people-groups who lived by herding animals of all types, e.g. cattle, donkeys, pigs, sheep and goats; also, known as *pastoral nomadism. Transhumance* reflects a group's movement of herds from one location to another, usually for seasonal reasons, usually following consistent patterns in a given area. The stories of the patriarchs are an example of transhumance in the biblical tradition. The pastoralist often tended a number of different kinds of animals in the biblical tradition; for example, Abraham and Lot are depicted as having herded camels and donkeys, along with sheep and goats: Gen 24:34 (cf. Gen 13:7). But for our purposes, *shepherding,* unless otherwise indicated, generally refers to the tending of sheep and goats. This is usually the intended meaning in the biblical tradition because both were herded together and at times are together in the biblical images of shepherding.

participated to one degree or another in the tending and guarding of the flocks/herds. Thus, in the biblical tradition shepherding was also entrusted to girls and women at least for the task of the watering of the flocks. In Genesis 29:6-10, Rachel is found watering the herd and in Exodus 2:16-18, Ruel's daughters are doing the same. Yet, the reality is that most of the time the shepherd is seen as a man or a group of men. This is especially true when grazing away from the nomadic camp or the village. The transhumance of herds and flocks from one area to another could often be many miles apart.[4] Gradually, this early nomadic pastoralism would give way to the village shepherd and a symbiotic relationship developed between shepherd and farmer. Transhumance continued with the village shepherds with the moving of the flocks/herds from one grazing area to another. This primarily involved moving from one altitude to another due to changes of seasons.[5]

The shepherd's clothing reflected the vocation: leather sandals, a girdle, and a cloak or mantle, sometimes made of leather but more often made of camel's hair. They carried a water bag and a kind of knapsack (I Sam 17:40—καδίῳ τῷ ποιμενικῷ) which contained food and a reed pipe (Jgs 5:16). Music was a way to calm the flock, and while other instruments were also played, the pipe was the most common.[6] A shepherd also carried with him three implements or weapons: a sling shot, a wooden club and a staff with a crooked handle. The sling shot and short club were used for protection. The sling was used to keep predators at bay. But when that failed, the club which was studded with sharp pieces of metal was used in close quarters. The staff with crooked handle, which could be used as a weapon, was more useful in rescuing

---

[4] Matthews and Benjamin (1993) 52-54; Wallis *TDOT* 13:545.
[5] Matthews and Benjamin (1993) 54.
[6] Wallis *TDOT* 13:546. It is a common assumption that David developed his skill as a musician while being 'with the sheep' (I Sam 16:18-19, 23).

sheep that had strayed. It also was used for guiding the sheep into the sheepfold and for counting them (Lev 27:32).[7] As the sheep entered the sheepfold for the night, they would be counted by laying the staff gently on their backs.[8] At night the shepherd's 'watching the flock' consisted mostly of listening; listening rather than watching played the greater part of protecting the flock. By listening, the shepherd would try to sort out the night sounds for cries, howls and roars of possible threats from natural predators.

The responsibilities of the shepherd consisted of not only protection from natural predators and theft from robbers and weather, but also provision of food, water and shelter. In regard to food and water the shepherd had to make the right decisions in order to know where to find sufficient provision for the flock. Also, the shepherd was responsible for setting the pace in leading the flock during transhumance so that they would not be overdriven. This was especially crucial when the ewes were pregnant or nursing the lambs, which could be too small to keep up the pace of the rest of the flock (Gen 33:13-14). The shepherd was usually stationed in the front and the flock led (Ps 23:2) rather than driven from behind. Thus, he kept them following him by the recognition of his voice. If the flock was large, it was not uncommon for there to be under-shepherds who followed to assure that none went astray (II Sam 7:8//I Chr 17:7, where David was taken from 'following the sheep'; cf. Am 7:15).[9]

The shelter of the sheepfold would vary in light of the area where the shepherd was grazing the sheep. For example, some shelters were permanent enclosures with a roof and stone walls, as possibly could be the case of the 'sheepfolds' that were located in or near a cave (I Sam 24:3). In flat regions, the shelter was possibly more

---

[7] Wallis *TDOT* 13:546.
[8] Cf. Jer 33:13, '...flocks shall again pass under the hands of the one who counts them, says the Lord'.
[9] Vancil *ABD* 5:1187.

temporary, consisting simply of an open pen with thorn bush sides. The responsibility of the shepherd for provision also included counting the herd at the end of each day to assure that none had been lost. Also at this time, each animal was checked for injury or any indication of disease.

In addition to the responsibility to provide food, water and shelter, the shepherd was also to provide healing and protection. The shepherd would protect the flock from natural predators, thieves, and weather.[10] These basic realities of the shepherd's existence become the grist for the metaphor.

It is fair to say that the description of the shepherd above in regard to tools of the trade and responsibilities did not change much down through the biblical tradition and beyond, but the nature of shepherding did change. The nomadic shepherd of the patriarchal period would become a village shepherd when Israel settled in the land. Shepherding would also become an occupation so that shepherds were employed by owners as hired hands to care for their flock. Different types of shepherds may be distinguished: first, the nomadic shepherds who had no permanent home or village. They were economically self-sufficient and supplemented what they needed through trade.[11] Second, there were the semi-nomadic shepherds who functioned as full-time herders having a home or village they were connected to without being economically independent. These continued to move the flocks from place to place, sometimes at great distances, according to the seasons and the availability of pasture, thus living away from their villages for days or weeks at a time.[12] Third, there were part-time herders who mixed both farming and shepherding and were normally self-employed. Typically, they owned their own stock. They also seldom stayed away from the village

[10] Mattingly (1985) 941.
[11] Matthews and Benjamin (1993) 52.
[12] Matthews and Benjamin (1993) 53-54.

for any length of time, thus remaining local.[13] Along with those mentioned so far, there were also the hired shepherds. As animals began to be raised commercially, this need increased and so owners entrusted the care of the flocks to these hired shepherds.[14] These different types of shepherds are working categories, and the metaphor may be informed more by one than another. When it is possible to determine which type relates to the metaphor, the distinctive dimensions are significant and impact the understanding of the metaphor. For example, the hired hand, whereas he could be a covenant-partner with the owner of either the sheep or the land, is often depicted as not caring for the sheep and therefore morally untrustworthy.

The sheep referred to in the biblical tradition is a cloven-hoofed mammal ruminant with spiral, hollow-horns. It is closely related to the goat. The dominant type of sheep in Palestine was probably the *fat-tailed sheep* which was named for its tail that was considered a delicacy, but also was used in sacrifices (Ex 29:22-25).[15] These sheep were usually off-white or cream-colored but could also be black. There were also spotted sheep, with some various shadings of brown and red. They had a very deep wool coat. The male is a ram, the female is a ewe, and the young are lambs. The 'wether' was a male sheep (or goat) that had been castrated prior to becoming sexually mature. Sheep mate in the fall and approximately one-hundred and fifty days (basically five months) later the 'spring' lambs were born. Lambs were weaned at about four and a half to six months. Lambs were mature by twenty-four months but might not have grown their full wool coat until three to five years. Normally they were

---

[13]Matthews and Benjamin (1993) 53.

[14] Wallis *TDOT* 13:546, 'As a consequence, there was now a difference between good and wicked shepherds (Zech 11:4-17; Jn 10:11, 14; Heb 13:20). At the very least, the repute of shepherds differed widely...The prestige of shepherds was undermined further by the suspicion that they were generally dishonest'.

[15] Köhler-Rollefson (1985) 937.

sheared once a year in the late springtime. This time of shearing was chosen to avoid the severe cold; otherwise sheep could die from exposure to the weather. Their life span was typically from seven to ten years.

The fat-tailed sheep was raised primarily for its wool. Wool was used mainly for clothing but also for rugs. However, when one was slaughtered every part of the animal was used. The hide or 'sheepskin' is light-weight leather and could be used to make sandals, curtains and leather pouches used for wine-skins, water-skins or milk-skins. From the sheep's bones were made needles, scrapers, lances, and arrowheads. The ram's horns could serve as an oil container (I Sam 16:1).[16] The ram's horn could also be made into a trumpet called a 'shofar' used for a battle cry and also as a call to worship (Josh 6:4). Sheep, of course, were used in the sacrificial system (Lev 1:10; 4:32; 5:15; 22:21) and on rare occasions were slaughtered for a guest as a sign of generous hospitality (II Sam 12:4; Nathan's parable to David speaks of this and portrays it as a costly act).

Since sheep are cud-chewing, they graze in the morning and during the afternoon they lie down to regurgitate their food. This rhythm shapes the shepherd's day. Sheep by nature are timid and helpless animals. They have no defenses, speed, or strength to naturally protect themselves from their predators. Therefore they are frightened easily, reacting with panic, which can lead to self-destruction. If the sheep is alone and a predator approaches, it becomes petrified with fear and simply lies down. Or if sheep are in a group when a predator approaches, they scatter. Sheep naturally group and feed together, but they are also susceptible to wandering from the flock while eating. These characteristics have stereotyped sheep as dumb animals, but

[16] Köhler-Rollefson (1985) 937.

they also show other traits that reflect a kind of instinctual cleverness and intelligence. They understand how to recognize good pasture and can sense a water source. They also have a good sense of the weather; in the heat they naturally seek shade, and in bad weather they naturally seek shelter. Most evident is their capacity to recognize the voice of the shepherd who is responsible for them. The shepherd can control a flock by his/her own distinctive voice. Sheep learn and distinguish the unique call of the shepherd and will quickly respond to it.

The goat is also a hollow-horned ruminant, but the sheep and the goat have many differing characteristics and habits. The goats of Palestine are mostly black rather than off-white but on occasion they can be spotted, hence Jacob's request in Gen 30:32. The goat was used primarily for its milk. Curdled goat's milk, which seems comparable to modern day yogurt, was basic to the diet of the shepherd. Most of the milk would have been used to make cheese. The meat of the goat is more tender and flavorful than the meat of the sheep so it was a delicacy (Gen 27:9; Jgs 15:1).[17]

Generally, the ratio of sheep to goats is about two sheep for every goat.[18] Even though they both are herbivores they can be herded together because they eat different things; sheep eat grass and goats eat primarily from brush and twigs. Also, when goats do eat grass, they eat only the leaves or tops of the grass and leave the rest of the plant undamaged. This allows the pasture to recover after grazing. Sheep, on the other hand, consume the whole plant. Therefore, if allowed to overgraze an area, they can destroy a pasture in one season. When sheep are mixed together with browsing goats, the goats keep the sheep moving through the pasture so that they do not overgraze an

[17] Köhler-Rollefson (1985) 350.
[18] Morrison (1981) 274.

area.[19] The problem with goats is that they have insatiable appetites and so for that reason can also overgraze an area. They are much more aggressive than the fat-tailed sheep and can harm the sheep if not watched. Thus, at the end of the day, the shepherd separates the sheep from the goats. The goats are given the warmer accommodations because goat hair is finer and provides less protection against the elements than the thick wool coat of the sheep.

4.1.1.1 Biblical Beginnings

Genesis and early biblical beginnings testify that the herding of flocks of animals is one of humanity's most ancient occupations. According to Genesis 4:2, 'Abel was a keeper of sheep,' and the patriarchs and matriarchs of ancient Israel would be described as shepherds and herders: 'Pharaoh said to his brothers [of Joseph], "What is your occupation?" And they said to Pharaoh, "Your servants are shepherds, as our ancestors were"'.[20]

As might be expected, the size and kind of herds one owns indicates wealth and prestige. When the oldest servant of Abraham[21] describes himself to Laban in regard to Rebekah, he says, 'I am Abraham's servant. The LORD has greatly blessed my master, and he has become wealthy; he has given him flocks and herds...camels and donkeys'.[22]

Genesis indicates that the shepherd may or may not be the owner of the flock/herd.[23] The shepherd might be the owner or simply be delegated to provide for and protect the flock. There is evidence throughout Genesis that the patriarchs and matriarchs of ancient Israel had to deal with the challenges and difficulty of finding sufficient pasture and water for the flocks. This often involved negotiating and contracting with the

---

[19] Morrison (1981) 173, n. 125.
[20] Gen 47:3.
[21] Gen 24:2.
[22] Gen 24:34-35.
[23] The shepherdess Rachel takes care of her father's sheep and later Jacob will do the same (Gen 29:6).

local inhabitants to take care of their flocks.[24] The patriarchs and matriarchs of ancient Israel, like many traditional peoples, treated land and animals the same way they cared for themselves.[25] Herding and shepherding were basic to these early household structures, giving them a livelihood and a sense of purpose as a community and thus informing the metaphor for describing their world.[26]

Before exploring the 'shepherding contracts' of the ANE, it is important to re-emphasize that while the nature of sheep and goats did not change much down through the centuries, shepherding in the biblical tradition did change and evolve. As noted above, changes occurred in the reality of how shepherds functioned in Israel, thus causing changes in perceptions about shepherds and the vocation. Early on, the Hebrews were a nomadic people. But, after the conquest of Canaan and the occupation of towns and villages, Israel became a settled society. The occupation of land and the creating of homes led to an agricultural setting where shepherding was just one aspect of the larger society. Shepherding also evolved from a whole community affair involving the whole family to a more specialized dimension of the community. The task of shepherding became an occupation which was done by others: the hired shepherds. By the time of the exile and after, throughout the Second Temple period, shepherding as a profession, while a necessity in society and therefore important, was often depicted as morally suspect.[27]

---

[24] Cf. e.g. Gen 13:5-12; 21:25-34; 29:1-10; 37:12-17.
[25] Matthews and Benjamin (1993) 58.
[26] Galaty and Johnson (1990) 18; Tapper (1979) 48-49.
[27] In a rather classic depiction of this cf. Beyreuther (1978) 3:566, 'Late Judaism drew a distinction between shepherds. After the exile the Pharisaic rabbis brought about a striking devaluation of the occupation of shepherd in Palestinian Judaism. In a time of poor pay, shepherds were suspected, perhaps often rightly, of dishonesty. The pious were forbidden to buy wool, milk or meat from shepherds. Civic privileges (the functions of judge and witness) were withdrawn from them as from the tax collectors. "No position in the world is as despised as that of the shepherd" (Midrash on Psalm 23)'.

This has traditionally been the way shepherding has been viewed in the first century as well. Yet, while this will appear to often be the case, it was not a hard and fast rule.[28]

4.1.1.2 Ancient Near Eastern 'herding contracts'

Whereas nomadic pastoralists were self-sufficient in many ways by living off the land and from the produce of the herds, they also needed the villages. Much has been written on the nature of this symbiotic or mutually dependent relationship between the village and the farmer.[29] One way this relationship is illustrated is through archaeological evidence of 'herding contracts' represented throughout the Fertile Crescent. The illustrations here are drawn from Larsa and Nuzi.[30] These contracts were developed between owners and contract shepherds as covenant partners.[31]

Within these contracts, the expectation of the shepherd was for the owner of the flock to provide about thirty-eight animals: about two-thirds sheep, one-third goats and two breed animals. This number was economic because it allowed for a fifteen percent loss of adult sheep and fourteen percent loss of goats to weather, predators and disease, which was the acceptable loss rate.[32] At the time of the annual shearing owners negotiated with the shepherds to pay either a flat fee or more commonly a commission for their labor. The contract was made annually. The shepherd would share in the profits of the flock and be held accountable if the contract was not fulfilled. The tablet/contract was sealed with the shepherd's seal which served as the 'signature'. This sealed contract served as the basis for sorting out the accounts at the end of the

---

[28] E.g. the 'Overseer' of the Camp at Qumran was still imaged in a positive light as a shepherd, *CD* 13:9.
[29] Bar-Yosef and Khazanov (1992) 5; Galaty and Johnson (1990) 23; Mohammed (1973) 97-112; Morrison (1981) 258-261.
[30] Larsa (2030 and 1763 BCE) is in southern Mesopotamia; Nuzi (1500-1250 BCE) in the north.
[31] Matthews and Benjamin (1993) 54-58.
[32] Morrison (1981) 276.

year, having taken into consideration both losses and growth to the flock.[33] The shepherd's payment for the season, if a flat fee, might be a certain number of young animals or a certain amount of wool along with milk/cheese from the flock, clothing or grain.[34] The approach toward paying by commission could be done in one of two ways. The records in Larsa indicate that the owners expected eighty percent of the ewes to produce lambs along with the loss rate mentioned above. As a result, they would either pay the shepherds with all lambs born beyond the agreed upon eighty percent or with any animals that survived the expected fifteen percent loss.[35] The shepherds described here are 'covenant partners' with the local farmers and owners of the herds because a 'covenant' was made between the two, creating this mutually dependent relationship. In Genesis 21:22-34 is the story of Abraham the 'alien' (v 23: גּוּר / παρῴκησας, cf. 34) making a 'covenant' (v 27: בְּרִית / διαθήκην) with Abimelech (cf. 26:26-33). This gave some assurance to the locals that the movements and activities of the foreign herders were controlled.[36] In the Larsa records the foreign shepherds are clearly free citizens and not slaves; they are involved in village life and appear as witnesses in the local assembly.

> The herders in the contracts from Larsa are clearly not slaves, but free citizens with full legal rights. They are paid for their work, and they settle disputes with their employers before the village or city assembly (Morrison 1981:261).[37]

The Code of Hammurabi (ca. 1795-1750 BCE) proposes legislation concerning shepherds and their accountability to society:

---

[33] Postgate (1975) 2.
[34] Cf. law no. 261 in the *Code of Hammurabi* below.
[35] Morrison (1983) 157.
[36] Mohammed (1973) 106-107.
[37] Morrison (1983) 261.

> 261: If [anyone] hired a shepherd to pasture cattle or sheep, he shall give him eight *kur* [38] of grain per year.
> 262: If [anyone] ... and ox or a sheep to...
> 263: If he has lost [the ox] or sheep which was committed to him, he shall make good ox for [ox], sheep for [sheep] to their owner.
> 264: If [a shepherd], to whom cattle or sheep were given to pasture, being in receipt of his wages in full, to his satisfaction, has then let the cattle decrease, has let the sheep decrease, thus lessening the birth rate, he shall give increase and profit in accordance with the terms of his contract.
> 265: If a shepherd, to whom cattle or sheep were given to pasture, became unfaithful and hence has altered the cattle mark or has sold (them), they shall prove it against him and he shall make good in cattle and sheep to their owner tenfold what he stole.
> 266: If a visitation of god has occurred in a sheepfold or a lion has made a kill, the shepherd shall prove himself innocent in the presence of god, but the owner of the sheepfold shall receive from him the animal stricken in the fold.
> 267: If the shepherd was careless and has let lameness develop in the fold, the shepherd shall make good in cattle and sheep the loss through the lameness which he let develop in the fold and give (them) to their owner.[39]

The *Code* seems to focus more on protecting the rights of the owner rather than the shepherd. The 'herding contracts' balance this by clarifying that both parties may benefit from the agreements. A shepherd might work alone, or if he accepted more sheep than he could pasture himself, he might employ 'under-shepherds' (*Akkadian kaparrum)* to help look after the flocks. The owner of the sheep might be a private individual, but the owner could also be a temple or the palace (i.e. the state administration). These various possibilities led to variations in the details of the agreement, but the underlying principle was unchanged: the shepherd accepted personal liability for the flocks and was remunerated in proportion to the growth of the flock and the amount of its produce. If an animal was lost and the shepherd was unable to produce its skin, he was obliged to replace it, either by another animal or in some fashion agreed to in the contract.[40] Under

---

[38] Pritchard (1969) 168a; footnote 60, 'A measure equal to little more than 7 bushels, divided into 300 *qu*'.
[39] Pritchard (1969) 177a.
[40] Postgate (1975) 6.

such an arrangement the shepherd had as strong an incentive as the owner himself to promote the welfare of the animals.[41]

Shepherds and farmers from the same community usually worked together in a symbiotic relation since both profited from the other, each providing different resources for the community. Foreign herders were viewed with much more suspicion because of their use of the land and water.[42] The independence of the foreign nomadic shepherd created suspicion on the part of the local farmers, shepherds, and villagers unless a covenant was cut. Without the herding contracts the common attitude toward the foreign herder was that they were tricksters or spies.

> Herders in strange lands compensated for their lack of power by an ability to manipulate the power of others. Like all marginalized people, they admired the clever who improved themselves at the expense of the local farmers and herders. Foreign herders were not outlaws, but they knew how to work the system to their advantage.[43]

Without the herding contracts these foreign herders were seen as a threat to the local land and water supplies.

The *Code of Hammurabi sec. 57-58* has further legislation concerning the relationship between the foreign shepherd and the local landowner:

> 57: If a shepherd has not come to an agreement with the owner of a field to pasture sheep on the grass, but has pastured sheep on the field without the consent of the owner of the field, when the owner of the field harvests his field, the shepherd who pastured the sheep on the field without the consent of the owner of the field shall have in addition twenty *kur* of grain per eighteen *iku* to the owner of the field.
> 58: If after the sheep have gone up from the meadow, when the whole flock has been shut up within the city-gate, the shepherd drove the sheep into a field and has then pastured the sheep on the field, the shepherd shall look after the field on which he pastured and at harvest-time he shall measure out sixty *kur* of grain per eighteen *iku* to the owner of the field.[44]

---

[41] Postgate (1975) 2.
[42] Matthews and Benjamin (1993) 54.
[43] Matthews and Benjamin (1993) 54.
[44] Prichard (1969) 168b-169a.

Generally, the dynamic between the 'locals' and the foreign shepherd seemed to have always been strained. The shepherds often felt exploited, and the villagers felt threatened. Herders regarded villagers with suspicion, and villagers considered herders as possible spies and/or tricksters. In the ancient stories of Israel's ancestors, this same attitude is reflected toward the foreign herders contracted by local villages to manage their livestock (Gen 26:17-22; Ex 17:8-13).[45]

The realities of shepherds and sheep in the ANE inform the metaphor and the use of the image in regard to the gods of Mesopotamia and Egypt and their rulers. The image of the shepherd is used in descriptors of both the divine and human leaders. The metaphor is often used to emphasize the role of compassionate provider, commanding protector and one who rules justly. It is also not uncommon for the images of the people to be likened to the flock.

4.1.2 The Shepherds of Mesopotamia

Since the third millennium BCE, the title of shepherd was the prerogative of the gods and kings. Many of the different deities of Mesopotamia are generally referred to as a shepherd with a focus often on compassionate concern for humanity.

The pastoral god Dumuzi was worshiped in Babylonia from the third to first millennium BCE. He was linked to the fertility of the flocks and the pasture that sustained them. Dumuzi becomes Tammuz in Assyro-Babylonian Empire and is referred to in Ezekiel 8:14. Dumuzi, the shepherd-god, wants to marry the goddess Inanna but is rejected in favor of the farmer-god Enkimdu. Dumuzi then gives all the reasons why he is superior. Utu, the sun-god, appeals to his sister to marry Dumuzi:

[45] Matthews and Benjamin (1993) 54-55.

> The shepherd, everything his hand touches is bright,
> O Inanna, let the shepherd Dumuzi marry thee,
> O thou who..., why art thou unwilling?[46]

The dispute does not end in murder but an agreement to peaceful co-existence.

> As for me, who am a shepherd, at my marriage,
> O farmer, may you be counted as a friend...[47]

The gods reflect the ongoing rivalry and interdependence between shepherd and farmer.

It is common to find the image of shepherd used in ANE creation stories. In the classic Akkadian myth of creation *Enuma elish,* Marduk is the shepherd of the people:

> Most exalted be the Son, our avenger;
> Let his sovereignty be surpassing, having no rival.
> May he shepherd the black-headed ones,[48] his creatures.[49]

Marduk, who has vanquished Tiamat, his mother, is also the shepherd of the gods. Marduk provides for the fertility of the land:

> May he shepherd all the gods like sheep...
> Tiamat; may her life be strait and short!
> Let the ears of shepherd and the herdsman be opened.
> Let him rejoice in Marduk...
> That his land may be fertile and that he may prosper.[50]

Another god from the pantheon of Mesopotamian gods was Enlil who was depicted as the faithful shepherd, worshipped as a source of fertility and order, by both farmer and shepherd:

> Faithful Shepherd, faithful Shepherd,
> God Enlil, faithful Shepherd,
> Master of all countries, [faithful] Shepherd,
> Lord of the..., faithful Shepherd,
> The lord who drew the outline of his hand...[51]

---

[46] Pritchard (1969) 41b.
[47] Pritchard (1969) 42b.
[48] An Akkadian metaphor for 'the human race'.
[49] Pritchard (1969) 69a.
[50] Pritchard (1969) 72b.
[51] Pritchard (1969) 337.

Many of the Mesopotamian epic heroes and kings were given the title of shepherd. The following list of gods date from the early third millennium till the time of Hammurabi:

> Etana, a shepherd, he who ascended to heaven (and) who consolidated all countries, became king and ruled 1,560 (var.: 1,500) years.[52] Etana, a shepherd, the one who to heaven ascended.[53]

In Lipit-Ishtar's Law code (ca. 1934-1924 BCE) he is: 'Lipit-Ishtar, the wise shepherd whose name had been pronounced by Nunamnir'.[54]

When the primary city of the Sumerians, Ur, was destroyed, one of the metaphors used to describe the distress was the shepherd/sheep metaphor and one of the main images is that of the sheepfold. The 'stable' and 'his sheepfold' become a refrain throughout the lament:[55]

> He has abandoned hi[s] stable, his sheepfold...
> O my city, like an innocent ewe thy lamb has been torn away from thee;...
> O Ur, like an innocent goat thy kid has perished....
> Like the sheepfold of a shepherd verily has been torn down;

The imagery is graphic and full of pathos, youth, innocence and devastation; the image of the city destroyed is described in this way: 'an innocent ewe whose lamb is torn away'. When it was time to lament, the shepherd/sheep metaphor was at hand.

Finally, in this short review of Mesopotamian deities and kings, the famous Hammurabi identifies himself as 'the shepherd' both in the preamble and the epilogue of his law code. The characteristics that are emphasized to describe Hammurabi are similar to those of YHWH. The preamble utilizes images similar to Psalm 23: 'affluence and plenty abound' and 'provides in abundance' may be compared to 'shall

---

[52] Pritchard (1969) 265.
[53] Pritchard (1969) 114.
[54] Pritchard (1969) 159.
[55] Pritchard (1969) 455-461.

not want' of Psalm 23:1-3. The divinely commissioned shepherd of the people guides them with justice.

The Preamble:

> Hammurabi, the shepherd, called by Enlil, am I;
> The one who makes affluence and plenty abound;
> Who provides in abundance all sorts of things for Nippur-Duranki;...
> The efficient king, who restored Eridu to its place.
> ...who makes the name of Babylon great...who made Ur prosper...
> ...the shepherd of the people, whose deeds are pleasing to Ishtar...
> When Marduk commissioned me to guide the people aright,...'.[56]

The Epilogue:

> I, Hammurabi, the perfect king,
> Was not careless (or) neglectful of the black-headed (people),
> Whom Enlil has presented to me,
> (and) whose shepherding Marduk had committed to me;
> I sought out peaceful regions for them;...
> The great gods called me,
> So I became the beneficent shepherd whose scepter is righteous;
> My benign shadow is spread over my city.
> In my bosom I carried the peoples of the land of Sumer and Akkad;
> They prospered under my protection;
> I always governed them in peace;
> I sheltered them in my wisdom.
> In order that the strong might not oppress the weak,
> That justice might be dealt the orphan (and) the widow,...
> To give justice to the oppressed.[57]

The epilogue's reference to 'peaceful regions' sounds like the 'still waters' of Psalm 23. The protection, peace and shelter are all consistent with the shepherd metaphor. Another shepherd image 'In my bosom I carried the peoples,' sounds similar to the language of Isaiah 40:11. The point of highlighting these writings is to show that the shepherd motif in other historical settings utilized similar images from the metaphor as are found in the biblical tradition. The image remains one of authority and providential care. There is a compassionate dimension, but the kindness is a functional duty of the

---

[56] Pritchard (1969) 164.
[57] Pritchard (1969)177-178.

sovereign and not a sentimental pastoral quality. The characteristics of benevolence and providential care appear simply to be taken for granted as involved in faithfulness to the kingly calling and so become quite impersonal attributes of the ruler, whether human or divine. The shepherd god/king is to be able and willing to give both provision and protection. He is vigilant and should not be found to be 'unfaithful' through inattention or indifference.

4.1.3 The Shepherds of Egypt

In comparison with Mesopotamia, the terminology of the shepherd is not as widespread in regard to the gods and kings in Egyptian myth and epic. Ipu-wer uses the image in his indictment against the current administration of Egyptian kings. It comes possibly during the decline between the Old and the Middle Kingdoms (2300-2050):[58]

> Behold, it has befallen that the land has been deprived of the kingship by a few lawless men...[59]...Behold, no offices are in their right place, like a herd running at random without a herdsman. Behold, cattle stray and there is none to collect them, but everyone fetches for himself those that are branded with his name.[60]

The use of the herding metaphor in the context of a crisis of leadership anticipates how the biblical tradition will also use the motif. Ipu-wer depicts the situation as a leaderless herd, 'running at random...cattle stray and there is none to collect them'. The image is similar to 'sheep without a shepherd' in the biblical tradition. In I Kings 22:17. The prophet Micaiah confronts the King of Israel, by using the phrase to indicate that the people are leaderless (cf. Num 27:17; Mt 9:37). Ipu-wer continues the metaphor in the hope that better leadership will come. At one point during his complaint he says:

---

[58] Pritchard (1969) 441a.
[59] Pritchard (1969) 442b.
[60] Pritchard (1969) 443a.

> Men shall say: 'He is the herdsman of all men. Evil is not in his heart. Though his herds may be small, still he has spent the day caring for [collecting] them...[61]

Other Egyptian gods were described as herdsman/shepherds, for example, the hymn of praise to the god Amon-Re-Har-akhti: 'Praise to thee, Amon-Re-Atum-Har-akhti,....Thy ears are open, hearing them and taking care of them, ...a herdsman who loves his herds'.[62] The primary god in Middle Kingdom Egypt was the sun god Amun-Re who is referred to implicitly as the herder of his people: 'chief of all gods, the good god, the beloved, who gives life to all that is warm and to all good cattle (people)'.[63]

The emphasis in these few samples from Egyptian sources also indicates a desire for the king/leader to be benevolent and provide for the needs of those under his care.

4.1.4 Summary

The shepherd metaphor was a universal metaphor for leadership in the ANE. The rulers understand that they are accountable to the gods in the way in which they rule. Both the deities and the kings of the ANE were depicted as shepherds and the people as the flock or herd. Just as a shepherd looks after the sheep by provision and protection, so the rulers/leaders were to be committed to a similar task. Also, while it is not a personal or sentimental compassion, the shepherds/rulers were to exercise benevolence in the midst of justice. This image of shepherding illustrated how authority was expected to be demonstrated. When rulership failed, it was critiqued according to the image of the shepherd. When there was tragedy, as in the case of the destruction of Ur, the national lamentation called upon the shepherd/sheep metaphor to articulate the loss. In the biblical tradition because of the uniqueness of *YHWH*, the leaders and kings in Israel were identified as shepherds as a group but not as individuals as we see among the

---

[61] Pritchard (1969) 443a.
[62] Pritchard (1969) 371b-372a.
[63] Prichard (1969) 365a.

Mesopotamian kings.[64] By the time of the NT the shepherd image was an established image used to describe leaders, whether good or bad. Matthew uses the image to address the crises of leadership in his own day much as Ipu-wer did two millennia before him.[65] But before concentrating on the shepherd/sheep metaphor in the biblical tradition, the remainder of this chapter will review the shepherd/sheep motif in the Greco-Roman tradition.

4.2 Shepherd/Sheep Metaphor in Greco-Roman Tradition

In the following section some of the practices and traditions associated with the task of shepherding in the Greco-Roman world will be compared and contrasted with the ANE.[66] The way the metaphor develops theologically and philosophically in the Greco-Roman context is different than the ANE. Some of the similarities and differences will be noted. Finally the shepherd gods will be referred to and Pan specifically will be considered. As a starting point, 'What was shepherding/herding like in the Greco-Roman world?'

4.2.1 The Literal Usage

Herding in early Greece, like the ANE, was a primary way of life involving semi-nomadic herders in which a pastoralist moved from location to location in search of grazing lands. Transhumance was also common in the Greco-Roman world, moving flocks or herds to different grazing grounds, often over long distances, especially between the summer and the winter months.[67] The domestication of sheep, goats, and cattle was practiced in Greece from the early Neolithic Period.[68] While livestock

---

[64] This will be discussed in Chapter 5 below.
[65] I am not contending, of course, that Matthew had any knowledge of Ipu-wer, only that the metaphor has had a long history and he will draw upon that history by way of the biblical tradition.
[66] Wallis *TDOT* 13:549.
[67] Isager and Skydsgaard (1992) 99-101.
[68] Ryder (1983) 57-58 for the prehistoric period. cf. Whittaker (1988).

provided meat it was a luxury; usually the slaughter of an animal was related to offering sacrifices to the gods, which resulted in meat, rather than a matter of killing an animal for eating only. Cattle, sheep and goats were used more for their capacity to provide the ongoing domestic needs. Cattle were used in the field as a beast of burden and in some cases for their milk. Sheep provided wool and milk. Goats were used for their milk only. All would have provided hides and other ingredients for differing needs of the community.

Each of these animals needed land for grazing and this involved society in the task of defining how to sustain the resources for the local community.

> Even if the quality of pasture in many places did not permit the keeping of cattle and horses over and above the essential minimum, every community was rich in sheep and goats. Yet there were limits set on individual holdings: whereas Euboulus of Elatea could consider keeping 1,000 sheep and goats, Athenians seem to have owned considerably smaller flocks – Panaetius had 84 sheep and 67 goats, numbers closely matched by other well-to-do property owners...[69]

As in many of the records of the ANE, we have evidence of disputes over grazing rights in the Greco-Roman traditions as well. A dialogue in Sophocles' tragedy, *Oedipus Tyrannus* (ca. 430 BCE), illustrates a dispute between two neighbors over rights to a summer pasture.[70] It was not uncommon for a city to control the use of grazing lands and to limit their use to its own citizens. In such cases the use of these grazing sites by foreigners was considered an honor. There are some instances when the city-states would impose pasture taxes when the grazing grounds were limited.[71]

There is an interesting tradition concerning foreign shepherds who 'steal to make friends'.[72] The foreign shepherd, in order to create an alliance with the local herders, first makes them his victim. When the one whose sheep that has been stolen comes making

---

[69] Burford (1993) 151.
[70] Sophocles, *Oedipus Tyrannus*, 1117-1140.
[71] Burford (1993) 152.
[72] Gutzwiller (1991) 41.

the accusation against the thief, a third party is called in who mediates the situation and is allowed to accomplish the return of the stolen sheep to the original owner. But the mediator encourages a commitment on the part of both parties to work together in the future. So an alliance is established and the foreign shepherd has accomplished his original goal, which was friendship with the local shepherds who now help protect him from the retaliatory actions of others.[73] So, in a very different way, similar results are accomplished as was the case with the 'herding contracts' and covenant shepherds of ANE.

The duties of the shepherd in the Greco-Roman world are much the same as in the ANE. The Roman writer Columella gives an account of how the herdsman/shepherd is to be 'observant and vigilant' *(circumspectus ac vigilans):*

> He should neither recline nor sit; for if he is not walking he ought to stand, since the task of the herdsman calls for a lofty and commanding elevation from which his eyes may observe as from a watchtower, ... lest a thief or predator cheat the shepherd while he is daydreaming (7.3.26).[74]

The herder's duty is to exercise vigilance in guarding the flock, and this is contrasted with the shepherd's susceptibility to boredom and sleep. This image of the shepherd who guards (φυλάσσω)[75] the flock becomes in Homer and Hesiod, and others, a metaphor to 'guard their thought or teaching'. 'Hesiod uses the verb frequently to admonish his reader to remember his teachings, so that "guarding" becomes a virtual synonym for the poet's ἀλήθεια'.[76] So, in the Greco-Roman tradition the emphasis is upon the shepherd's integrity and vigilance rather than the compassionate benevolence and justice that are

---

[73] Gutzwiller (1991) 41.
[74] Quoted in Gutzwiller (1991) 31.
[75] LSJ:44721 φυλάσσω—3. metaph. *to keep, maintain, cherish,* χόλον, ὅρκιἀ φ. ἔπος *to observe* a command; no,mon Soph.; φ. σκαιοσύναν *to cling to* it, *foster* it; Pass., φυλάττεσθαι παρά τινι *to be fostered in* or *by.*
[76] Gutzwiller (1991) 32.

emphasized in Mesopotamian and Egyptian literature.[77] Consequently, the negative characteristics depicted in the literature are untruthfulness, absorption in music to the neglect of duty,[78] laziness and distraction, and theft of flocks belonging to kinsmen or neighbors.

4.2.2 The Metaphorical Usage

The metaphorical use of the shepherd image is widespread. Aeschylus calls a storm at sea an 'evil shepherd', and even captains are spoken of as 'shepherds of ships'.[79] Most often it refers to leadership as exercised, for example, by rulers and army commanders. The image is used in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* which would suggest that it had already acquired an accepted and customary meaning in very early times. Agamemnon is ποιμήν λαῶν 'shepherd of the people',[80] a common phrase in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* often used to describe various individuals in both the Greek and Trojan military.[81] The military shepherd is a theme in Hesiod; Jason is a military shepherd in *Theogony 1000.*

In Homer the shepherd/herder is compared to the (military) hero.[82] The shepherd brings stability and/or restores order in a situation where confusion and chaos dominate. The shepherd metaphor emphasizes bringing order out of confusion rather than protection from the predator as in the classic ANE sense. *Iliad* 2.474-477 uses the image of the goat herder who separates and orders the flock as a hero-king.

Just as goatherds **sort out/separate**	τοὺς δ' ὡς τ' αἰπόλια πλατὲ αἰγῶν
with ease the wandering beasts,	αἰπόλοι ἄνδρες ῥεῖα **διακρίνωσιν**,
all mixed up in the pasture, so through all	ἐπεί κε νομῷ μιγέωσιν ὡς τοὺς
the army, the leaders organized the troops	ἡγεμόνες διεκόσμεον ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα

[77] Gutzwiller (1991) 44.
[78] Note how these themes are consistent with the ANE and will emerge in the biblical tradition as well.
[79] *Agamemnon, 65.7, The Suppliant Maidens, 767.*
[80] E.g. Agamemnon, et. al. in, *Iliad, 2.75-109, 243-254, Odyssey 3.156,14,497.*
[81] Vancil *ABD* 5:1189.
[82] The following material is based upon the work of Gutzwiller (1991) 24-29.

for battle.	ὑσμίνηνδ ἰέναι

The shepherd separating and organizing his goats/sheep becomes a metaphor for military leaders organizing troops for battle. In Hesiod's *Theogony* (85-86) a similar passage describes the good king as one who 'portions out judgments with straight decisions' (διακρίνοντα θέμιστας ἰθείῃσι δίκῃσιν). The leader is to provide 'straight decisions' in lieu of crooked judgments that allow for chaos. When good leadership is not given, it allows for confusion and disorder that lead to the injustices and violations of people and property.[83]

The semantic domain of words related to the basic stem 'νεμ' also reflects the order of the pastoral nature of shepherding and the ordering of human relationships according to Homer.[84] In Homer the essential meaning of νέμω is to dispense in an orderly fashion, 'to deal out, distribute, dispense'.[85] For the shepherd the places of ordering are the grazing areas and the fold.

The shepherd lives with the flock, with the realities of the weather and predators, but in the face of these is called upon to exercise integrity and vigilance and provision and protection. In Homer the 'pasture' is called νομός, the herder of any kind is called a νομεύς, and the place that the animals are provided for is the νέμονται (pasture). This Homeric language and usage will influence the way Plato articulates and uses the herder/shepherd image when he speaks of the way the gods both care for and create order and the way the true 'philosopher-king' is to implement his legislation.[86]

---

[83] Gutzwiller (1991) 24.
[84] Beyreuther (1978) 564; ποιμαίνω becomes the alternative to the more archaic νομεύς, because even by the time of Plato he has to define the term as meaning 'the one who distributes' (ὁ διανέμων).
[85] LSJ:28486 νέμω—A. *to deal out, distribute, dispense,* of meat and drink, Hom.
[86] Gutzwiller (1991) 25.

Related to this theme of the hero are the stories of how they are 'called' by the gods or commissioned by the gods. This was evident in the ANE sources as well. Hesiod is 'called' by the Muses while he is shepherding his flock:

> And one day they taught Hesiod a glorious song while he was shepherding his lambs under holy Helicon, and this word first the goddesses said to me-- the Muses of Olympus, daughters of Zeus who holds the aegis: 'Shepherds of the wilderness, wretched things of shame, mere bellies, we know how to speak many false things as though they were true; but we know, when we will, to utter true things.' So said the ready-voiced daughters of great Zeus, and they plucked and gave me a rod, a shoot of sturdy laurel, a marvelous thing, and breathed into me a divine voice to celebrate things that shall be and things there were aforetime; and they bade me sing of the race of the blessed gods that are eternal, but ever to sing of themselves both first and last.[87]

The shepherd learns to become a leader after being a shepherd, which is seen as a kind of preparation for leadership. This rather universal theme occurs throughout the ancient world, whether the ANE, the Hebrew tradition, the later Hellenistic tradition (for example Philo) or here in the ancient Greco-Roman tradition: leadership is learned by being a shepherd.

In the later Greco-Roman period the philosopher (king/ruler) who becomes the statesman is to be like a shepherd. This is developed by Plato in the *Republic.* Socrates was once asked about Agamemnon and why he was always referred to as ποιμήν λαῶν 'shepherd of the people'. Xenophon records this response:

> Isn't it because a shepherd must see to it that his sheep are safe and have food, and that the object for which they are raised is obtained; while a general too must see to it that his soldiers are safe and have supplies, and that the goal for which they are in the army will be attained?... A king is chosen not to take good care of himself, but so that the men who chose him may prosper. It is not easy to find anything finer than this goal or anything more disgraceful than it's opposite.[88]

---

[87] *Theogony* 20-25.
[88] *Memorabilia* 2:1-4

Xenophon himself says, 'the duties of a good shepherd and of a good king were very much alike; a good shepherd ought, while deriving benefit from his flocks, to make them happy (so far as sheep can be said to have happiness), and in the same way a king ought to make his people and his cities happy, if he would derive benefits from them.'[89] It is at this point that the Greco-Roman use of metaphor differs from the ANE usage. The shepherd image in the ANE emphasizes a solidarity binding shepherd and people together in relationship whereas in Greece the philosopher-ruler relates to the people simply in governance.[90] Thus, the motif is 'applied to the philosophers, who as statesmen are expected to serve the best interests of those entrusted to their care, with whom, they have nothing in common'.[91]

In contrast to this military shepherd, the Greeks also develop their own pastoral literature. The *bucolic* poetry from the fifth century and following will idealize the pastoral. But even this idealization of summer days and pastoral delights were poetic attempts to explore the deeper issues of life.[92] Additionally, in contrast to these pastoral delights, the shepherd metaphor occurs in the tragic poets as well.

The Greek dramas, illustrated in Sophocles and Euripides, endeavor to delve into the contradictions of the shepherd. They present the irreconcilable split between the character that is both culturally inferior, the shepherd, and yet at times morally and intellectually superior to those in a higher class. Or, they will present a herder character who is more than he initially appears to be and who later emerges as the noble individual (the hero) who is the focal point of the drama. The opposite is present as well; the shepherd who is the rough, unrefined lout of the stereotypical elitist

---

[89] *Cyropaedia,* 8.2,14.
[90] Vancil *ABD* 5:1189.
[91] Wallis *TDOT* 13:549.
[92] Vancil *ABD* 5:1189. Cf. the *Bucolic* poetic tradition: E.g. Theocritus, *The Bucolic Poets*; Virgil, *Eclogues.*

imagination. These antitheses create the dual images of the shepherd metaphor in the Greco-Roman period.[93]

Plato made full use of the shepherd/sheep metaphor as a way of clarifying and defining justice. In *The Republic*, he uses it in relation to both the political and the psychological dynamics of the relationship between ruler and subject.[94] Again, in *The Statesman,* the image is used to show how the leader, the philosopher-king, serves only for the interest of the people he governs.[95]

Yet the reality of shepherding as a vocation was looked down upon; recognized as dirty and smelly since the real shepherd lived with the sheep. Aristotle described the vocation of the shepherd:

> ...laziest are shepherds, who lead an idle life, and get their subsistence without trouble from tame animals; their flocks having to wander from place to place in search of pasture, they are compelled to follow them, cultivating a sort of living farm.[96]

In order to reveal as blatantly as possible the tension that existed between the reality and the ideal, we bring to conclusion this brief overview with another quote from Aristotle that illustrates the tension:

---

[93] Gutzwiller (1991) 45-65.

[94] *Republic* 1.343b, 1.345cd, 3. 416a. 4.440d. [345c]'But, as it is, you see, Thrasymachus--let us return to the previous examples—you see that while you began by taking the physician in the true sense of the word, you did not think fit afterwards to be consistent and maintain with precision the notion of the true shepherd, but you apparently think that what is best for the sheep but as if he were a banqueter about to be feasted with regard to the good cheer or again with a view to the sale of them[345d] as if he were a money-maker and not a shepherd. But the art of the shepherd surely is concerned with nothing else than how to provide what is best for that over which is set, since its own affairs, its own best estate, are entirely sufficiently provided for so long as it in nowise fails of being the shepherd's art. And in like manner I supposed that we just now were constrained to acknowledge that every form of rule in so far as it is rule considers what is best for nothing else than that which is governed and cared for by it,[345e] alike in political and private rule. Why, do you think that the rulers and holders of office in our cities--the true rulers --willingly hold office and rule?" "I don't think," he said, "I know right well they do." "But what of other forms of rule, Thrasymachus? Do you not perceive that no one chooses of his own will to hold the office of rule, but they demand pay, which implies that not to them will benefit accrue from their holding office but to those whom they rule?"' Cf. Gutzwiller (1991) 66-69.

[95] *The Statesman, 266-272b.*

[96] *Politics* 1.8.

> The friendship of a king for his subjects is one of superiority in beneficence; for a king does good to his subjects, inasmuch as being good he studies to promote their welfare, as a shepherd studies the welfare of his sheep; hence Homer called Agamemnon 'shepherd of the people.[97]

Thus, though few wanted to be shepherds with real sheep, the metaphor persisted through antiquity among persons leading others and in the descriptions of the gods. Next, we turn to consider Pan the Greco-Roman deity of herders and shepherds.

4.2.3 Pan: The god of the herders and shepherds[98]

Similar to the ANE, the Greco-Roman world linked a number of the gods with the shepherd image—there were a pantheon of shepherd deities available to Greek and later to Roman individuals. So, for example, Hermes carries the lamb or ram over his shoulders. Apollo, a popular god in the pantheon and traditionally the son of Zeus, was associated with prophecy (at Delphi), healing, music and archery. He was also the protector of herds. But it is Pan the god of herds and shepherds--sometimes the son of Hermes, Zeus or some other god--that deserves careful consideration. Pan was attributed with inventing the shepherd's pipe. Though originally simply the god of herdsmen, later (toward the later part of the first century BCE and the first century CE) he became increasingly popular and had a universal appeal as deity beyond that of the herdsman. Especially significant is that in Christian legend Pan's death was associated with the death and resurrection of Christ.

Pan was the fertility god for the flocks of shepherds and herders. Although he is one of the oldest creations of Greek folklore, he does not play a significant role in the 'higher mythology' of Homer and Hesiod. The original home of Pan was Arcadia in Greece. He is described as having a human torso and arms but with the legs, ears, and the

---

[97] *Nicomachean Ethics* 5.15.

[98] LSJ: 31193 Pan, gen. Πᾱνός, ὁ *Pan,* god of Arcadia, son of Hermes, η. Hom.; represented with goat's feet, horns, and shaggy hair. At Athens his worship began after the battle of Marathon, Hdt.:-pl. Πᾶνες in Ar., Theocr.

horns of a goat. The tradition of the shepherd-god is featured in one of the later Homeric hymns, often dated around the time of Pindar, c.522/518-442/438 BCE. The hymn celebrates his birth and claims he is 'the dear son of Hermes', who takes him to Zeus and shows him off to the rest of the gods. In their delight they named him Pan, 'because he delighted all their hearts'. In spite of the lack of his importance in the 'higher mythology' it would appear that Pan played an important role in the daily life of shepherds and herders. Although not associated with the epic myths, Pan is associated with a story relating how he invented a musical pipe with seven reeds. Pan is also a lover of lonely places like caves and mountains.

Pan's popularity as a god began in the early fifth century BCE. A story, told by Herodotus explains how Pan came to have the cave shrine on the Acropolis. In 490 BCE Pan appeared to the Athenian runner Pheidippides and promised help against the Persians:

> Before they left the city, the Athenian generals sent off a message to Sparta. The messenger was an Athenian named Pheidippides, a professional long-distance runner. Pheidippides met the god Pan on Mount Parthenium, above Tegea. Pan, he said, called him by name and told him to ask the Athenians why they paid him no attention, in spite of his friendliness towards them and the fact that he had often been useful to them in the past, and would be so again in the future. The Athenians believed Pheidippides's story, and when their affairs were once more in a prosperous state, they built a shrine to Pan under the Acropolis, and from the time his message was received they held an annual ceremony, with a torch-race and sacrifices, to court his protection.[99]

It was the help of Pan at the battle of Marathon (490) that gave them the victory. In later times, during the first and second centuries BCE, Pan becomes a kind of universal god as a result of his name: Πάς or Πάν: 'the guardian of all'.

---

[99] *Histories* 6.105. The appearance of Pan was probably on his way to Sparta, not on his run back to Athens with news of the victory as is sometimes claimed. Herodotus was writing about fifty years after the event so it is reasonable to think Pheidippides was a historical figure, he just never mentions the famous marathon run from Marathon to Athens. That run, in all likelihood is a legend and is first told by Plutarch naming a different runner in *On the Glory of Athens.*

Finally, there is a famous story from Plutarch's *Moralia,* in the essay, 'The Obsolescence of Oracles' concerning the death of Pan. This story provides a fitting conclusion to this section on the Greco-Roman tradition.[100] According to Plutarch,[101] during the reign of Tiberius (AD 14-37), the passengers and crew of a boat off western Greece were startled to hear a voice reporting the news that the Great Pan was dead. The story provoked amazement and fear. It eventually reached Rome. When Plutarch retold the story less than a century later, he intended it as proof that even the gods die.

> As for death among such beings, I have heard the words of a man who was not a a fool nor an imposter...Epitherses,.... He said that once upon a time in making a voyage to Italy he embarked on a ship carrying freight and many passengers. It was already evening when, near the Echinades Islands, the wind dropped, and the ship drifted near Paxin...Suddenly from the island of Paxin was heard the voice of someone loudly calling Thamus...Twice he was called and made no reply, but the third time he answered: and the caller, raising his voice, said, "When you come opposite to Palodes, announce that Great Pan is dead." On hearing this, all...were astounded and reasoned among themselves whether it was better to carry out the order or to refuse to meddle and let the matter go. Under the circumstances Thamus made up his mind that if there should be a breeze, he would sail past and keep quiet, but with no wind and smooth sea...he would announce what he had heard...looking toward the land, [he] said the words as he had heard them: 'Great Pan is dead.'...[102]

Pan the shepherd-god had died. Even if Plutarch was indicating symbolically a death of the pantheon of the gods generally, the pantheon would continue for many years. Whatever the real reason for Plutarch's remembering the story, it became for many Christians in subsequent generations a prophetic story.[103] In Christian legend this story was associated with the death and resurrection of Christ. In the time of Tiberius a new shepherd was born. It was the beginning of a new age with the fulfillment of the ancient Hebrew prophet's promise 'from you [Bethlehem] shall come a ruler who is to shepherd my people Israel'.

---

[100] Plutarch (1935) 5:401.
[101] Lamberton (2001) 46-120.
[102] Plutarch, *Mor.*418-419.
[103] E.g. Eusebius of Caesarea, *The Preparation of the Gospel* 5.17.

4.3 Summary

The shepherd metaphor is as widespread in the Greco-Roman tradition as in the ANE tradition. In common with ANE, the shepherd metaphor is a metaphor for the leader, but in the Greco-Roman tradition it is sometimes the military commander and in the later tradition the philosopher-king/statesman. As in ANE, there is often an association with being 'called' or some sense of having a divine mandate or destiny when the image is applied to the leader. We will also see this in the Biblical tradition in the next chapter.

The role of a shepherd can also illustrate a leader trained in obscurity, in order to emerge as competent and just. There is at least one dimension within the Greco-Roman tradition that would put more emphasis on integrity and justice rather than compassion. The shepherd is not the model itself but is the role of preparation for becoming a king, warrior, poet, seer, or even a god.

There would appear to be two streams of thought in the tradition leading to a third more centrist model: 1) the military shepherd and 2) the *ideal* shepherd and 3) the philosopher-king who while different than those who follow is to have their best interest as the priority. The military shepherd who leads and makes the 'straight decisions' as a military person orders his troops in the field and leads with efficiency and effectiveness. The other image is a shepherd who cares for and provides for the safety of the sheep in a more ideal situation of quiet and calm, the *bucolic* tradition. The philosophic tradition represented by Socrates, Plato and others is that the shepherd metaphor is useful to describe the leader. But, in reality, the philosopher-king is different from those he leads and so an elitist distinction remains. As we turn to examine the biblical tradition, we will see many similarities of the shepherd, but also distinctive characteristics.

CHAPTER 5
YHWH: THE SHEPHERD OF ISRAEL AND THE UNDER-SHEPHERDS OF HIS PEOPLE

5.1 *YHWH*: The Shepherd of Israel

In this chapter, the shepherd/sheep metaphor will be explored as it applies to *YHWH,* the Shepherd of Israel and the people of Israel, the 'flock' of God. Also considered are the leaders of Israel who are the under-shepherds of the shepherd *YHWH.* The metaphor is used both positively and negatively. It is used to illustrate the good shepherd but also describes an evil or anti-shepherd which emerges in the prophets. The term under-shepherd is not a biblical term but is used here to emphasize that the leaders of Israel are defined, whether positively or negatively, by their relationship to *YHWH,* the shepherd of Israel. The way the leaders choose to shepherd the people of God was always evaluated and critiqued on the basis of the character of *YHWH.* To the extent that the character of the leaders of Israel reflects the character of *YHWH* they are good shepherds and vice-versa. In the OT there are two primary traditions that inform the shepherd/sheep metaphor: 1) The Moses/exodus[1] tradition concerning *YHWH's* deliverance of Israel from Egyptian bondage including the wilderness wanderings and the conquest culminating in the fulfillment of God's promise to provide a place for the people of Israel. 2) The second major influence upon the shepherd/sheep motif is the royal Davidic tradition.[2] Since rulers were 'shepherds' in the ANE, it made the influence of David, a shepherd by vocation, a natural one. These two traditions inform the shepherd/sheep image throughout the biblical tradition. Another development introduced through the prophetic tradition is the theme of the evil or unfaithful shepherd. This aspect of the shepherd/sheep motif

[1] The Moses/exodus tradition will alternately be called the exodus/wilderness/conquest tradition.
[2] The royal Davidic tradition will alternately be called the Davidic tradition.

arises in times of crisis or contested leadership. We will see this as we explore the biblical tradition.

5.1.1 Introduction

In the Hebrew Bible, only *YHWH* is the shepherd of Israel. In the biblical tradition of Israel there is no indication that the nominative title of 'shepherd' was ever applied to a reigning king of Israel.[3] There is no specific explanation given for this but it may be an attempt to acknowledge and establish *YHWH* as the unique shepherd of Israel, even during the monarchy. It may also be that since the shepherd metaphor was used in the wider ANE, there was a certain restraint in Israel as referring to kings by the title 'shepherd'.[4] However, the verb 'to shepherd or to pasture', used metaphorically, was used of leadership. Though not in a titular fashion, it was used in regard to function: the shepherd shepherds the people as a shepherd shepherds the flock. So, for example, when David was anointed king in II Sam 5:2 the promise is: 'The LORD said to you: It is you who shall be shepherd (רעה, ποιμαίνω) of my people Israel, you who shall be ruler (לְנָגִיד, ἡγούμενον)[5] over Israel.'

אַתָּה תִּרְעֶה אֶת־עַמִּי אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל
Israel my people pasture/tend shall you
ποιμανεῖς τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ισραηλ

This reference to David is the closest reference to an individual being called the shepherd of Israel. In contrast to this, the eschatological David is referred to as the shepherd (e.g. Jer 23:5-6; Ez 34:24-25; 37:24) who will shepherd Israel like *YHWH,* the shepherd of Israel. More often the metaphor is applied to Israel's leadership as a whole; it may refer to shepherds as a group, for example in Jeremiah and Ezekiel. The

---

[3] Wallis *TDOT* 13:550.
[4] Wallis *TDOT* 13:550
[5] HALOT5357 נָגִיד: chief, leader, sovereign, prince. LEH4129: ἡγούμενος: ruler, commander; leader over, head of, chief of.

historical example of shepherding contracts possibly provides a background for the image of the under-shepherds of Israel who were to be covenant partners with *YHWH*. It is during the time of the latter prophetic literature that the metaphor of shepherd/sheep is most prominent in the biblical tradition concerning the leaders of Israel.

The verb רָעָה (qal) means primarily 'to cause to graze', or 'to tend', also 'to pasture, to guard' and occurs 167/8 times. The substantive (רֹעֶה, רֹעִים) shepherd, occurs approximately 83 times (רֹעָה: shepherdess, Gn 29:9, once). The verb may be used intransitively of flocks and herds (e.g. Is 5:17; 11:7; 14:30; 27:10; 30:23; 65:25; Jon 3:7; Zeph 2:7; 3:13; Job 1:14) and is often a metaphor symbolizing the peaceful life of both animals and humans in some future time. Transitively used, the verb describes the area or place being 'grazed'. The normal or majority usage of the transitive verb occurs in regard to the work of the shepherd, emphasizing function, as the one who normally tends sheep and goats. 'The qal active participal *ro'eh,* [רֹעֶה] "shepherd," generally retains its verbal force, being used with an accusative object'.[6]

The shepherd/sheep motif is widespread in the biblical tradition. In the OT, there are two passages where the metaphor is used in a concentrated fashion, Ezekiel 34 and Zechariah 11. Ezekiel 34 uses the metaphor thirty-one out of thirty-two times in Ezekiel. Otherwise, it is only found in Ezekiel 37:24. Zechariah 11 contains ten out of a total of fourteen uses in Zechariah 10-13. In contrast to these two concentrated uses of the metaphor are the more typical distribution: Genesis twenty-three times (almost always the literal usage);[7] I Samuel, seven times; II Samuel twice, (5:2 and 7:7); Song of Solomon, seven times; the Psalms, eight times; Isaiah, seventeen times

---

[6] Wallis *TDOT* 13:545.

[7] The two exceptions being Genesis 48:15 and 49:24.

(nine from chapters 40-66); in the prophet Jeremiah, twenty-seven times; and Micah, five times.[8] This chapter will not endeavor to examine every biblical reference to the metaphor. It will consider passages that will help to provide a basis for understanding the use of the shepherd metaphor and will take special note of those shepherd/sheep texts that are either quoted or alluded to by Matthew.

The two metaphorical uses in Genesis are both when Jacob speaks of God as his shepherd, the first is in Genesis 48:15, (רעה, the LXX reads ὁ θεὸς ὁ τρέφων[9] με, τρέφω rather than ποιμήν). Also of note is the use of the personal pronoun which is normally applied to the community. Jacob uses the metaphor again in Genesis 49:24 when he prays to the 'Mighty One...the Shepherd, the Rock of Israel.' In light of Jacob's vocation as a shepherd it is understandable that the image would be used in regard to God. This description of *YHWH* as shepherd is also found in Psalm 80:1, 'O shepherd (רֹעֶה, ποιμαίνων) of Israel hearken, 'O Guide of the flock (צֹאן, πρόβατα) of Joseph', and in Psalm 95:7, 'For He is our God and we are the people he pastures/provides a grazing place (מַרְעִית, νομή), the flock (צֹאן, πρόβατα) he guides'. Finally, the metaphor is extended in Psalm 23 by the psalmist in order to explore the meaning of 'The Lord is my shepherd' (יְהוָה רֹעִי, κύριος ποιμαίνει με). The use of the personal pronoun in Genesis 48 and Psalm 23 would appear to be unique in the biblical tradition. This will be examined further below.

---

[8] These statistics generally follow Soggin *TLOT* 3:1246 and Wallis *TDOT* 13:544-545.

[9] LEH8965 τρέφω Gn 6:19-20; 48:15; Num 6:5; Dt 32:18 A: *to feed, to nourish;* Gn 48:15; (metaph.) Bar 4:11; *to rear, to bring up, to educate* (an anim.) Is 7:21; *to let grow* Nm 6:5 M: *to grow up* Is 33:18. BDAG: 1. to care for by providing food or nourishment, *feed, nourish, support.* Cf. Mt 6:26, 25:37.

5.1.2 *YHWH* as the Shepherd of Israel

While there are only four shepherd texts that directly give God the title Shepherd,[10] the metaphor was a primary image for God throughout Israelite history. By association the people of God were the sheep of his pasture. God is depicted as 'feeding' (רָעָה,), 'gathering' (קָבַץ, συνάγω) the young lambs (טָלֶה, ἄρνας) into his arms and carrying them next to his bosom (חֵיק, γαστρὶ)[11], while he gently leads the ewes to provision and protection in Isaiah 40:10. This description is bracketed by the description of a God who 'comes with might, and his arm rules (בְּחָזָק, κυριείας[12])' (40:10) and one 'who has measured the waters in the hollow of his hand' (40:12). The tender compassion and the concern for the well being of the flock are bracketed by the sovereign power of *YHWH*. The prophet illustrates with the shepherd metaphor that God is provider of all the necessities in life and that the Lord will give guidance and protection to the small and the vulnerable. The image of the shepherd leading and protecting the ewes is illustrated by Jacob's comments to Esau when he is concerned that the nursing ewes not be 'overdriven' in Genesis 33:13. *YHWH* as shepherd protects the young and the old alike in order to 'save [his] people, to bless his heritage; to be their shepherd, and carry them forever' (Ps 28:9).

This image of God, leading, guiding and providing, is also associated with the Exodus of Israel from Egypt. The shepherd metaphor is implied in the Song of Moses when God as a shepherd leads the people out of danger into safe pasture (Exodus 15:13, 17). The Psalmist, also in the context of exodus/wilderness/conquest, depicts

---

[10] Gen. 48:15, 49:24; Ps. 23:1; 80:1.

[11] HALOT2837, חֵיק 1. lower, outer front of the body where loved ones (infants and animals) are pressed closely, **lap**, Num 11:12; I Ki 3:20; 17:19; Is 40:11.

[12] HALOTl2458 חָזָק 2. God comes בְּחָזָק **b^{e}ḥāzāq** as the strong one Is 40:10. LEH5409: κυριεία,-ας, authority, power.

God as a shepherd who makes room for his own flock and drives others out in order to provide for his own (78:52-55). The provision extends beyond the Exodus into the time of David whom God 'chose' (בָּחַר, qal; ἐκλέγομαι, aor. mid.) and took from the 'sheepfolds' (מִכְלְאֹת צֹאן) in order to make him 'the shepherd of his people Jacob, of Israel, his inheritance' (78:70-72). Note here that the Lord may be imaged as the shepherd owner and David his under-shepherd. *YHWH* owns the sheep, they are 'his inheritance', and David is chosen by God to be his covenant partner.

When the eclipse of God is the psalmist's plight, the shepherd/sheep metaphor provides an image to describe the people's distress and disappointment at God's absence. In Psalm 44 the flock has been sold for a trifle in order to be butchered and forgotten (Psalm 44:11-12, 20, 22; cf. Isaiah 56:10-11). Towards the end of the lament the Divine shepherd is imaged as being asleep (v 22). This is the epitome of a shepherd's neglect or abandonment.

In contrast to this apparent divine absence is God's covenant commitment as the shepherd of Israel and the covenant partnership with his under-shepherds. This is portrayed in the classic shepherd psalm, Psalm 23. Normally the image of shepherd/sheep is one of a shepherd with his flock, so it reflects the community of Israel, the whole people of God. One of the distinctive characteristics of Psalm 23 is the use of the personal pronoun *my* (cf. Gen 48:15) rather than the more frequent plural usage. The shepherd metaphor, traditionally interpreted communally as 'flock' (Ps 80:1) or the 'sheep of his pasture' (e.g. Ps 95, 100) is more typical. The use of the personal pronoun in regard to the shepherd motif 'is here given its most personal interpretation in the entire biblical tradition'.[13]

[13] Craigie (1983) 206, 'Even if the use of "I/my" was intended, or later interpreted, in a communal

The extended metaphor in Psalm 23 emphasizes the fundamental aspects of the shepherd. Not least is the fact that the shepherd lives with the flock, no matter what the circumstances, and becomes everything to the sheep: guide, physician/healer, protector, and provider. The shepherd knows the pastoral territory; its green meadows, its dangers and its treacherous terrain. The shepherd knows the sheep and how best to care for them according to their needs and according to the seasons of the year. Earlier in the biblical tradition this was emphasized in the Jacob story when he becomes angry at Laban and describes his faithfulness to him and his flocks as a shepherd: 'These twenty years I have been with you: your ewes and your female goats have not miscarried, and I have not eaten the rams or your flocks...by day the heat consumed me, and cold by night, and sleep fled from my eyes.' (Gen 31:36-42). Psalm 23 classically describes *YHWH* as the shepherd and his peoples as the sheep of his pasture. We will explore this shepherd psalm in more detail in the following analysis.

5.1.3 Psalm 23

A primary question concerning the structure of Psalm 23 on has to do with whether the shepherd metaphor is extended throughout the psalm or concludes at verse 4. Traditionally, the most common approach is to understand an abrupt division of the psalm between God as shepherd and God as host by the change of imagery between vv 1-4 and vv 5-6.[14] When approaching the structure of the psalm with this division in mind, interpreters understand verses 5-6 as a liturgical sacrificial banquet of thanksgiving.[15] Others, who understand the shepherd metaphor to extend through the

---

sense, the implications of a personal association with the shepherd remain'.

[14] For a discussion of the different approaches to structure and setting cf. Craigie (1983) 204-205, 207-208 and Kraus (1988) 1:304-306.

[15] Johnson (1970) 269-271; Vogt (1953) 195-211.

psalm, choose to amend the text in order to make it pertain to the shepherd image.[16] Alternatively to both of these approaches, is a third option of recognizing a larger more encompassing theme which provides clarification to the way the shepherd metaphor is used throughout the psalm. One such approach has been to propose an exilic or post-exilic remembrance of the exodus as providing hope in the context of distress. The exodus/wilderness/conquest tradition allows the shepherd metaphor to be maintained from beginning to end.[17] Yet, another perspective is to emphasize the kingly dimension of the shepherd metaphor and identify the psalm as a 'royal psalm' describing the characteristics and celebration of the shepherd king.[18] Others have argued that the 'host' image continues throughout vv. 5-6 but as the 'shepherd-host' and by this contend that the shepherd metaphor is maintained throughout the psalm.[19]

The approach taken in this thesis will be to argue that the shepherd metaphor extends to the end of the psalm and is integrated throughout in its various aspects by the underlying and more encompassing theme of the exodus; including the wilderness wanderings and the final entrance into and habitation in the Promised Land or the 'domain of God'.[20]

YHWH's shepherding of Israel during the Exodus and the wilderness years are the basis of the psalmist's own confidence and assurance in *YHWH* as shepherd. The psalmist's use of the Exodus theme enriches the meaning of the psalm. Thus, the metaphors are not simplistic comparisons between sheep and shepherd but are linked

---

[16] Morgenstern (1946) 13-24. Morgenstern changes 'a table before my enemies' to 'arms for my defense against my enemies'.
[17] Freedman (1976) 139-166; Milne (1974) 237-247.
[18] Tappy (1995) 255, n 60... 'Ps 23 constitutes a fine *royal psalm*, fit for recital in a coronation day festival. The leader publicly acknowledges the duties of kingship (vv 2-3); in them, he is to emulate the treatment which he himself receives from *YHWH* (v 5); the covenant of kingship is confirmed in the meal (v 6); the king becomes the adopted son of *YHWH* (v 7; cf. II Sam 7:14; Ps 2:7)'.
[19] Cf. e.g. Anderson (2000) 180-184; Broyles (1999) 124-125; Freedman (1976) 159-165; Knight (1904) 19-46; Milne (1974) 245-247; Paterson (1950) 108-115; Smith (1980) 5-23; Terrien (2003) 239.
[20] Freedman (1976) 139-140.

linguistically to God's provision and protection in the wilderness sojourn and his faithfulness to keep his covenant with Israel to bring Israel into a place/domain of plenty, a land 'overflowing'. The psalmist links his personal and individual experience with the central event in Israel's story, the exodus/wilderness/conquest.[21] God is both personal as 'my shepherd' but also the God who is communally present with his people when they must pass through a national and historic 'shadow of death' like the exodus.

Some of the intertextual links between the exodus motif and the psalm will be compared in the table on the next page and be discussed in the following section.[22]

As we examine Psalm 23, a proposed outline in light of the assumption of the extended metaphor taken in this thesis is:[23]

I Prologue: *YHWH* the Shepherd—1
II The Shepherd as Herder—2-3a
III The Shepherd as Guide—3b-4
IV The Shepherd as Host—5
V Epilogue: With *YHWH* 'all of my days'—6

[21] Craigie (1983) 207. The Exodus theme and Ps 23 is informed by Craigie, Freedman (1976) 139-166 and Milne (1974) 237-247.
[22] The table is an adaptation of and expansion of Broyles (1999) 124-125.
[23] This outline reflects the decision to understand the shepherd metaphor to be extended throughout the psalm, including verses 5-6; and that the name *YHWH* functions as an *inclusio* providing introduction (v 1) and conclusion (v 6).

Ps 23:1 The LORD is my **shepherd**,	**Ps 80:1** Give ear, O **Shepherd** of Israel, you who lead Joseph like a flock! (cf. 8-11 for the exodus/wilderness/conquest motif)
I shall **lack nothing** (חָסֵר)[24]	**Deut 2:7** …These forty years the LORD your God has been with you; you have **lacked nothing** (חָסֵר)
23:2 He makes me lie down in green **pastures** (נָוֶה);	**Ex 15:13** …you guided them by your strength to your holy **abode** (נָוֶה).[25]
he **leads** (נהל 'to guide') me beside **still** (מְנוּחָה) waters;	**Num 10:33** …with the ark of the covenant of the LORD going before them…, to seek out a **resting** (מְנוּחָה)[26] place for them,
23:3 he restores my soul. He **leads** (נחה) me in right paths	**Ex 15:13** In your steadfast love you **led** (נחה)[27] the people whom you redeemed; you **guided** (נהל)[28] them….
for his **name's sake**.	**Ps 106:8** At the Red Sea *YHWH* 'saved [Israel] for his **name's sake**'.
23:4 Even though I walk through the **darkest** (צַלְמָוֶת) **valley,**	**Jer 2:6** Where is the LORD who brought us up from the land of Egypt, who led us in the wilderness…in a land of drought and **deep darkness** (צַלְמָוֶת)[29]
I fear no evil; for you are **with** (עִמָּד) me; your rod and your staff-- they comfort me.	**Deut 2:7** …These forty years the LORD your God has been **with** (עִמְּךָ)you;
23:5 You **prepare a table** (שֻׁלְחָן) before me in the presence of my enemies; you anoint my head with oil; my cup overflows.	**Ps 78:19** They spoke against God, saying, 'Can God **spread a table** (שֻׁלְחָן) in the wilderness?'
23:6 Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life, and I shall dwell in the house of the LORD (בְּבֵית־יְהוָה) my whole life long.	**Ps 23:1**, יְהוָה רֹעִי, *YHWH* my shepherd; the Divine name works as an *inclusio*.

[24] HALOT2139חָסֵר 1. diminish, 2. do without, lack Deut 2:7; Ps 23:1.

[25] HALOT5419נָוֶה: destination of (semi-)nomadic tribe > pasturage > camping place > place of residence, home: 1. pasturage 2S 7:8, for camels Ez 25:5; 2. abode, residence: a) haunt (of animals) Is 34:13; b) = house Jb 5:3; c) Palestine is nāweh for Jacob/Isr. Jer 10:25, 50:19; nᵉwēh šālôm Is 32:18; d) Palestine is nāweh for Yahweh. 2S 15:15. In Jer 23:3 the Lord will gather scattered Israel back to the 'fold' נָוֶה, 'dwelling place, habitation, abode'.

[26] HALOT4738מְנוּחָה: rest: 1. spatial: a) resting-place Gn 49:15, mê mᵉnûḥâ beside the water Ps 23:2, śar mᵉnûḥâ quarter-master Je 51:51; b) place of quiet, tranquility Is 28:12, home Ru 1:9; c) Canaan as residence for Isr. 1K 8:56; d) God's abode Is 66:1; bêt mᵉnûḥâ for the ark 1C 28:2. 2. psychological: quieting, calming 2S 14:17.

[27] נחה: 'leads' is also used in Ps 78:14, 53, 72; along with the early poetry of Num 23:7 and Deut. 32:12. Used 18 times in the Pss, cf. esp. Ps 77:20, 'led your people like a flock, by the hand of Moses and Aaron'.

[28] HALOT5396נהל: guide, help along, lead carefully; Ex 15:13; Is 40:11, 'gently lead the mother sheep'.

[29] HALOT7206צַלְמָוֶת: darkness; Ps 23:4 and Jer 2:6; cf. Pss 44:20, 107:10, 14; Is 9:1; Jer 3:16.

I Introduction: *YHWH* the Shepherd—1

The name of *YHWH* works as an *inclusio*: after the initial, A Psalm of David. The opening words of the psalm are *YHWH* is my shepherd (יְהוָה רֹעִי, κύριος ποιμαίνει με). The divine name also occurs again in the final phrase of the final verse (v 6, בְּבֵית־יְהוָה לְאֹרֶךְ יָמִים, ἐν οἴκῳ κυρίου εἰς μακρότητα ἡμερῶν). The intervening verses will identify what the psalmist means when he refers to God as his shepherd. Along with this focus on the divine name of God and who God is for the psalmist is also the distinctive word 'my'. In the majority of texts referring to God the shepherd, he is shepherd of his people (e.g. Ps 80:1, 'of Israel').[30] The tone of the psalm is very personal throughout; first-person pronominal subjects appear in every line except 3c, 'for his name's sake'. Yet, this personal dimension never shifts the central focus away from *YHWH's* character as shepherd.

The attitude of the Psalmist from the beginning of the Psalm is one of confident trust and assurance, 'I shall not want' (חסר). This reflects the psalmist's confidence in the character of God and may allude to particular historical circumstances of provision and care. For example, the same verb is associated with God's provision in the wilderness in Deuteronomy 2:7; 'these forty years the Lord your God has been *with* you: you have *lacked nothing*' (חסר, cf. also Psalm 78:52-53). While this is a very personal reference, the confidence expressed is voiced in the context of Israel's historical relationship with *YHWH.* So, the psalmist's experience is not only a personal story but is also part of the history of Israel. *YHWH* has been faithful in the larger context of his people; yet the psalmist identifies this faithfulness

[30] As noted in the table above, God as shepherd in Psalm 80 is also associated with the exodus/wilderness/conquest in verses 8-11.

to the group as faithfulness to himself as an individual. Here, I propose that verse 1 is a heading or title for the whole psalm rather than an introduction to the first four verses. With the use of both 'my' and 'I' the focus for the psalmist is 'present in tense and personal in nature'.[31]

II The Shepherd as Herder—2-3a

The divine herder understands the experience of the daily rhythm of the shepherd and that understanding is reflected here in the imagery of the psalm. After the sheep and goats have grazed through the morning and are now satisfied, they must also have water and shade to protect them from the noon and afternoon heat. A water supply needs to be relatively 'still' or placid, as sheep do not like a swift current or a rushing brook, they will only drink from 'still' water.

Along with the focus on the role of the shepherd as provider and guide are the possible allusions to the exodus/wilderness/conquest tradition: the guidance (נהל) given in 23:2 is also given in Exodus 15:13 and the 'placid/still waters' (מְנוּחָה/ἀναπαυσις) of 23:2 may also allude to a 'placid/resting-place' (מנוּחָה/ἀναπαυσις) in the wilderness, referred to in Numbers 10:33. God provides and guides in the life of the psalmist as he did with the people of God in the wilderness.

III The Shepherd as Guide—3b-4

There is a connection between the 'right paths' (צֶדֶק/δικαιοσύνη) in v. 3b and the theme of righteousness. The shepherd knows the right choices to make. Despite weather and seasonal change, beast or thief, or difficulty of any other kind the shepherd guide knows how to lead the flock. The phrase 'for his name's sake' is a

---

[31] Tappy (1995) 261. Cf. Miller (1986) 94, who notes, 'The lead verse often sets up the primary subject matter as, e.g. , in Psalms 1:1; 8:1; 23:1; 42:1; 46:1;...'.

metonym for God's character; it is because of God's integrity that the psalmist claims that God, his shepherd, is his sure guide.[32]

The difficulty of the Palestinian terrain is the context for the next phrase in v 4. The 'flock' (and individual members of it) have assurance in the midst of 'the valley of death's shadows'(בְּגֵיא צַלְמָוֶת/ἐν μέσῳ σκιᾶς θανάτου) because of their confidence in the wise leadership of the shepherd. Kraus reminds us that 'in the interpretation of these wanderings of the flock we must without question think of the long distances of the transhumance...'[33] Similar language is used by Jeremiah to describe *YHWH's* faithfulness in the wilderness experience during which God 'led us...in a land of drought and deep darkness' (צַלְמָוֶת).[34] In vs 4, the confession of trust is made and shifts in vs 4b from the first person to the second person 'you' with a double address in v 4b. Presence again emerges to the forefront, 'you are with me'. The tools of the shepherd's trade (rod and staff) are metaphors of comfort and protection.

IV The Shepherd as Host—5

For most commentators, at this point in the psalm, the metaphor changes and a shift made so that the remainder of the poem is taken literally such that it speaks of literal 'tables', 'enemies', 'anointing oil', 'cups' and 'house of God'. *YHWH* becomes the host and provides for one who is pursued or tormented by enemies in the safety of his temple in the setting of a sacrificial meal. For these interpreters God provides refuge and a thanksgiving banquet, usually in a sanctuary or temple. Thus, verses 1-4 speak of *YHWH* as shepherd while verses 5-6 present *YHWH* as the host who offers hospitality in safety from all enemies.

---

[32] Terrien (2003) 240.
[33] Kraus (1988) 1:308.
[34] HALOT7206 צַלְמָוֶת: darkness, gloom (deeper than חֹשֶׁךְ), an impenetrable gloom, pitch darkness: Ps 23:4, 44:20; 107:10, 14; Is 9:1; Jer 2:6, 3:16.

Yet, if the unifying theme is not the shepherd image alone, but the shepherd image as understood in light of the exodus/wilderness/conquest tradition, then verses 5-6 can be explained in a more consistent and satisfactory manner. I propose that if the exodus/ wilderness/conquest tradition is the larger unifying theme that depicts *YHWH* as shepherd, then a shepherd-host motif can continue the metaphor throughout the psalm. Thus, the images in vv 5-6 continue the shepherd motif rather than shifting to a literal, cultic setting.

To begin with one might ask, 'What does the shepherd host have to do with a host?

> He is protector of the sheep as they wander in search of grazing land. Yet he is also the protector of the traveler who finds hospitality in his tent from the dangers and enemies of the desert....In Psalm 23, Yahweh is portrayed as the Shepherd in both aspects of the shepherd's life: as the Leader of the flock, and as the hospitable Host.[35]

In this sense, *YHWH* as shepherd then cares for his sheep as 'Leader of the flock'—provider, healer, guide, protector but also as the 'hospitable shepherd host', inviting his people into the security and sufficiency of his covenant love (חֶסֶד). This is especially true when the shepherd is being portrayed as a host in the wilderness.

If understanding vs 5 in this way, the 'table' imagery then can be related to Ps 78:19 where, in the context of wilderness rebellion where God is challenged and the people speak against God saying, 'Can God spread a table in the wilderness?' The verses that follow reveal that God did provide but the people still did not believe (78:32). So, if the tradition behind Psalm 23 is the exodus/wilderness/conquest, the assertion in v 5a is not as odd as it may first appear. There is the further possibility that the model behind the shepherd host's 'table in the wilderness' is the 'shepherd's table', which

---

[35] Anderson (2000) 181.

was an animal skin that would be thrown on the ground, becoming a 'table' (cf. Is 21:5).[36]

While it is not the majority position to understand the 'anointing' and the 'overflowing' cup as metaphorical, there is no historical or textual reason to automatically assume that the imagery in the psalm has shifted from the metaphorical to the literal interpretation. If *table* is taken to be metaphorical along with the imagery of *anointing, cup,* and *overflowing,* used together they express the extravagance of God's provision. The root terms for *anointing* (דשן, fatness[37]) and *overflowing* (רְוָיָה, saturation[38]) are not often found together[39] but in Jeremiah 31:14 the two terms are found together in relation to the shepherd image in Jer 31:10-14. Here, in an oracle of restoration and redemption, *YHWH* guards Israel like a flock and protects them from those who are stronger (vv 10-11). The goodness of the Lord provides for them in abundance; turning morning into joy, bringing fatness (דשן) and satisfaction (רְוָיָה) (vv 12-14). When Ps 23:5 is approached in this way, the shepherd metaphor can be continued in light of the exodus/wilderness/conquest tradition.

The 'cup' when used metaphorically[40] in the psalms may indicate allegiance (16:5 'my chosen and portion') and blessing (116:13) or God's judgment (e.g. 11:6; 17:14; 75:8). So here the cup represents the provision of God. Here, in v 5b, the

---

[36] HALOT8639 שֻׁלְחָן table 1. secular use: perh. animal skin laid on the ground for a meal. Note also that in Is 21:5 the context is amidst enemies and hostility.

[37] *TWOT*(457b)דָּשֵׁן (dāshēn) fat: Since fat animals were considered the healthiest and the fat was regarded as the best part of sacrificial animals (cf. Ps 20:3(4)), the metaphorical usage of 'fat' becomes 'prosperous' or 'rich'. Ps 23:5, the head 'anointed (made fat) with oil' describes the blessing of God.

[38] *TWOT*(2130c)רְוָיָה (r^{e}wāyâ) saturation: superabundance, overflowing.

[39] Only Prov 11:25; Is 34:7 and Jer 31:14.

[40] When the shepherd image is attempted without the metaphorical dimension applied to the cup, interpreters refer to the literal use of *cup* in II Samuel 12:1–4, where Nathan uses it in the parable of the poor man whose beloved lamb drinks from his own cup. This approach is unnecessary in our interpretation.

emphasis is not on the cup itself but its contents, which are 'full' or 'overflowing'.[41] God's presence as the shepherd host is contrasted with 'presence of my enemies'. The extravagance of God's protection is expressed in the steadfast love (חֶסֶד) that will pursue the psalmist (v 6) rather than his enemies . This use of חֶסֶד again calls to mind Exodus 15:13, 'In steadfast love you led the people whom you redeemed; you guided them by your strength to your holy abode'.[42] God's intention is to guide them to a place of safety and goodness set apart for his people.

V Epilogue: With *YHWH* 'all of my days'—6

'The house of *YHWH*' is typically taken literally as referring in some way to sanctuary or Temple. In contrast to this typical approach, Milne and Freedman, along with F. M. Cross argue that it can be understood as referring to Jerusalem and/or Judea the holy land rather than the sanctuary or temple.[43] Thus, in Hosea 8:1, the phrase is used to refer to the land (Cf. Hos 9:15, Jer 12:7 and Zech 9:8 that use 'my house' to refer to the land). To further explore 'house of the LORD' in Hosea, Hosea 9:3 reads:

9:3 לֹא יֵשְׁבוּ בְּאֶרֶץ יְהוָה
They shall not remain in the land of the LORD;

This is parallel to 9:4 which reads:

9:4 לֹא יָבוֹא בֵּית יְהוָה
[they] shall not come to the house of the LORD.[44]

---

[41] The significance of *cup* is often in the contents rather than the cup itself: good, life sustaining, satisfying, encouraging fellowship or the opposite, drunkenness, sickness or even death.

[42] Milne (1974) 244, 'Thus *tov wa-chesed* [טוֹב וְחֶסֶד] may be attributes of Yahweh, particularly symbolic of his activity of redeeming his people, used in Psalm 23:6 to recall the exodus event, and linked by parallel structuring to other terms which are also used figuratively of Yahweh's activity of liberating his people in the exodus experience'. Cf. Ps 62:11-12.

[43] Milne (1974) 245. 'The poem in Exodus 15 does not use *bet yhwh* but it does close with a threefold reference to the place of Yahweh: the mountain of his inheritance, his abode, and his sanctuary (v 17)'. Citing Cross (1978) 247 she notes 'that in Exodus 15:17 the phrase designates the hill country of Canaan as the special heritage of Yahweh'. Also, v 17 uses 'your abode, the sanctuary (מִקְדָּשׁ)...' to refer to the land.

[44] Freedman (1975) 164. 'It has long been recognized that the expression *byt yhwh* in Hosea 8:1 and 9:4 does not refer to the temple in Jerusalem,...but rather to the whole land of Ephraim (= Israel, the northern kingdom or what was left of it in Hosea's time), regarded as Yahweh's territory'.

In this approach, what is being affirmed by the psalmist is that he will dwell in the domain of *YHWH*, God's holy land for the rest of his days.[45] The conclusion of the poem focuses on the intent and desire of the psalmist to remain always in God's presence.

Alternatively, Johnson approaches the phrase somewhat differently but his appeal here is that 'house' means the 'household' of *YHWH.* All who call upon and put their trust in him belong to the 'household' of *YHWH*, the people of God.[46] It is not the physical place, though that is not excluded, but it is heritage enjoyed whether celebrated in the literal temple or celebrated in the whole of existence. So, Johnson translates the final verse: 'Yea, I shall be pursued by unfailing kindness everyday of my life, finding a home in the Household of Yahweh for many a long year'.[47]

This interpretation of Psalm 23 shows that the shepherd metaphor is given a context and informed by the exodus/wilderness/conquest tradition. Interpreting Ps 23 in light of this tradition allows the imagery of the shepherd to be extended throughout the psalm. Thus, the shepherd metaphor is not abandoned for a literal interpretation of sanctuary or Temple nor is the shepherd metaphor forced in verses vs 5-6. The exodus/wilderness/conquest tradition simply provides a context in which the shepherd psalm is a personal expression of the confidence placed in *YHWH* in light of Israel's historical relationship with *YHWH.*[48]

---

[45] Cf. Psalm 78:52-55, where e.g. the LXX has ἁγιάσματος αὐτοῦ ὄρος, for 'his holy hill' (הַר־זֶה קָדְשׁוֹ) in 78:54 Cf. LEH54ἁγίασμα,-ατος: Ex 15:17; 25:8; 28:36; 29:6, 34: *sanctuary* Ex 15:17; *holy object* Ez 20:40. Kraus (1993) 129, 'In v. 54 the exodus tradition immediately changes to the Zion tradition. This sudden transition, in which the settlement concentrates exclusively on Zion, is also to be established in Exod. 15:17. The chosen mountain stands for the embodiment of the holy land; the land is "holy" because Yahweh is enthroned in its midst, on Zion'.

[46] Johnson (1983) 264. Unfortunately he does not deal with the imagery in verse 5, he discusses verse 4 and then jumps to verse 6.

[47] Johnson (1983) 264-271 for his arguments and numerous references.

[48] Milne (1974) 244-245.

5.1.4 Israel as 'the sheep' of *YHWH's* pasture

It was as shepherd in the Moses/exodus tradition that *YHWH* 'led out his people like sheep (צֹאן[49]), and guided them in the wilderness like a flock (עֵדֶר[50])' (Ps 78:52). Also, in Micah 7:14 the people of God are called the 'the flock (צֹאן) that belongs to you (inheritance)' and are associated with the miracles of the exodus (Mic 7:15). This understanding of the sheep/flock metaphor identifies Israel as belonging to God. On the basis of this, the psalmist will appeal for the worship of *YHWH* and for listening 'to his voice' (Ps 95:6-7). Metaphorically, the motif of Israel as a flock was used throughout the biblical tradition to describe Israel. Israel is described as a flock in distress (Jer 3:17). Or, conversely, in a positive image, as a flock under *YHWH's* care in Is 40:11. The covenant relationship between *YHWH* as shepherd and Israel as 'the sheep of his pasture' is emphasized throughout the OT. In the Psalms, this covenant relationship is described in Ps 74:1; 77:21(20); 78:52; 79:13; 80:1; 95:7; 100:3.[51]

In Ps 95, the discussion of flock also includes a warning against the rebellious and hardened heart. This warning is also couched in the Moses/exodus tradition 'as on the day at Messiah in the wilderness,' the ancestors rebelled (Ps 95:8-11).

Traditionally, the depiction of *YHWH* as the shepherd has implied a comparison between the people of God and sheep. It may well be an anachronism to assume that in antiquity this comparison was meant to be derogatory (for example, implying the stupidity of humans). The OT does not necessarily imply this. The psalmist, for example, uses the metaphor to expresses confidence and trust in the God who is his shepherd. It is from this image of *YHWH* as shepherd that Israel understands,

---

[49] HALOT7049צֹאן (273 ×): small cattle, i.e. sheep & goats. Cf. Zech 10:3

[50] HALOT6109 עֵדֶר : flock, herd (belonging to an individual) (i.e. of sheep, goats, or cattle) Gen 29:2; hā'ēder of king = people Jer 13:20.

[51] Laniak (2006) 109.

'It is he who made us, and we are his; we are his people, the sheep of his pasture' (Ps 100:3). *YHWH* created Israel (cf. Is 43:1, 21; 44:2; Deut. 32:6, 15) therefore the psalmist understands that Israel is God's possession (Ex 19:5; Ps 78:55). The people are then described as 'sheep of his pasture'. He is the 'livestock owner'. *YHWH* as shepherd is Lord and leader of those who belong to him. The psalms celebrate this image as much or more than any other part of the biblical tradition.[52]

5.1.5 Summary

I have highlighted the connection between the shepherd/sheep metaphor and the exodus/wilderness/conquest tradition to emphasize the way in which that tradition shapes the understanding of the metaphor in the biblical tradition. The prophets will extend the metaphor to include the future Shepherd-Messiah who will promise a 'second exodus'. They will also complement the Mosus/exodus tradition with the royal Davidic Messiah who will gather the scattered flock of Israel.

While the texts referring directly to *YHWH* as shepherd are relatively few in number, the image itself dominates the biblical tradition along with other shepherd related metaphors for God. As noted above, the motif of God leading and providing are often related to the metaphor. It becomes a primary way that Israel reflects on the character of *YHWH* and also on its own identity as a people. The anachronistic tendency to associate the image with demeaning or pejorative ideas, for example, sheep are stupid or shepherds are dirty, is not found in the biblical tradition. The metaphor is appreciated in both its corporate dimension and the personal, individual dimensions. Finally, *YHWH* is the only ultimate shepherd of Israel. All uses of the metaphor in regard to leaders or rulers in Israel are shepherds only in relationship to the true shepherd of Israel, *YHWH.*

---

[52] E.g. people as 'sheep' in Psalms 44:11, 22; 49:14; 74:1; 78:52, 70-71; 79:13; 95:7; 100:3; 119:176; 144:13. Cf. Sohn (1991) 84-88, 164-168.

5.2 The Under-Shepherds of His People

Next we will turn our discussion from *YHWH*, the Shepherd of Israel to the individuals that provided leadership for the people of Israel. These leaders were to lead the Israelites consistent with the character of God, thus they are considered the under-shepherds of God's people.

5.2.1 The Patriarchs: The Shepherd Heritage

Throughout Genesis the patriarchs are shown to be engaged in various types of occupational activity—both pastoral and non-pastoral. The biblical tradition describes them as shepherds of small livestock, i.e. sheep and goats (רעה צאן[53]). It is as pastoralists that the tradition casts them when they go down to Egypt in Genesis 46:32 and 47:3. As an occupation this became a natural way for them to speak about God.

Early in Genesis all the patriarchs are portrayed as shepherds. Abel in 4:2 is called the first 'keeper of sheep' (רעה צאן, ποιμὴν προβάτων) in the Bible. Abraham in 21:28 gives seven ewe lambs (כִּבְשָׂה[54], ἑπτὰ ἀμνάδας[55] προβάτων) to Abimelech, 'in order that you may be a witness for me that I dug this well'. Here, Abraham is re-establishing his water rights at Beersheba. Jacob is depicted as shepherd throughout the Jacob-Laban cycle and Judah after him in 38.17.

The first time in the biblical tradition God is spoken of as shepherd is by Jacob who uses the personal pronoun. The personal pronoun is the exception rather than the normal plural: 'my shepherd (רעה, ὁ τρέφων με) all my life to this day'. This is also the first metaphorical use in Genesis. It has been noted that a herding cycle similar to the

---

[53] HALOT7049 צאן (273 ×): f.: small cattle, i.e. sheep & goats Gn 4:2; sheep only 1S 25:2; males only (thus m.) Gn 30:40; individual animals Ps 114:4; metaph. = Isr. 2S 24:17.
[54] HALOT3689 כִּבְשָׂה: young ewe-lamb Gn 21:28-30; Lv 14:40; Nu 6:14; 2S 12:3f.
[55] LEH ἀμνάς,-άδος *(ewe)lamb* Gn 21:28

Old Babylonian period and of Nuzi is reflected in the Jacob and Laban narrative.[56] The time when the shepherd gave an accounting to the owner for the season's labors and new contracts were established was at the annual shearing the sheep. This is possibly reflected in Genesis 29:21-27 and again in Genesis 30:25-36. Jacob also emphasized the hardship and challenges of the shepherding task 'by day the heat consumed me, and the cold by night, and my sleep fled from my eyes'.[57] While herding was only one part of the patriarchal economy[58]it is shown throughout Genesis that it certainly was a key part. The shepherding occupation was a basic part of the patriarchal tradition and when the patriarchs were described by their vocation, they were described as shepherds (Gen 47:3).

5.2.2 Moses: The Shepherd Lawgiver[59]

Moses' life and legacy shape the biblical tradition. Early in the narrative he is described as 'keeping the flock' (רֹעֶה אֶת־צֹאן; ποιμαίνων τὰ πρόβατα) of his father-in-law Jethro. The biblical tradition fundamentally presents Moses as a shepherd. In Israel's history the biblical writers understand the exodus/wilderness/conquest tradition accounts as revealing *YHWH* as the deliverer, defender, provider and guide of the people of Israel and Moses as God's under-shepherd.

In Numbers 27:17 Moses prays that God will not leave Israel shepherdless but will provide a shepherd for them who will 'lead them in(יְבִיאֵם)...and ...lead them out' (יוֹצִיאֵם). Moses uses the shepherd metaphor as a primary image of leadership, as a shepherd provides 'leadership' for a flock so the shepherd is to lead God's people:

---

[56] Morrison (1983) 158-160; Matthews and Mims (1985) 185-195.
[57] Morrison (1983) 158.
[58] Matthews (1981) 215, emphasizes that by Genesis 19:1 herding was only part of their economic livelihood and through their contact with settled communities 'they thereby became an integrated part of the total society, including at least an outward acceptance of legal and social customs'.
[59] Jeremias *TDNT* 6:848-873.

רֹעֶה אֵין־לָהֶם אֲשֶׁר[60] כַּצֹּאן יְהוָה עֲדַת[61]
a shepherd without may not be so that like sheep LORD of the congregation
οὐκ ἔσται ἡ συναγωγὴ κυρίου ὡσεὶ πρόβατα οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν ποιμήν

There is also a charismatic aspect related to those chosen by *YHWH* for leadership in Israel (Num 27:16-21; cf. Is 11:1-9; 44:28-45:1). Moses is commanded to take Joshua 'a man in whom is the spirit' (אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר־רוּחַ בּוֹ, τὸν Ἰησοῦν υἱὸν Ναυη ἄνθρωπον ὃς ἔχει πνεῦμα) and through the laying on of a hand is to commission him in the presence of the priest and the people of Israel. This text concerning the need for leadership, that the sheep be not shepherdless, will re-emerge a number of times in the biblical tradition. Matthew will quote this text to describe the situation in his own day and the need for true leadership in Israel (Mt 9:36). The context here in Numbers has Moses praying to the Lord that he will provide the needed leadership. He prays that God will choose and commission someone to succeed him and asks that the same authority be given to the one who is to lead after he passes from the scene. In a similar fashion the Matthean context has Jesus appealing for prayer (δεήθητε aor. pass. imp. from δέομαι ask, pray or beg) and passing on his leadership to those God has given him, the twelve.

Long after the role of shepherd has been passed on, the psalmist remembered Moses, 'You led your people like a flock (נָחִיתָ כַצֹּאן עַמֶּךָ, ὡδήγησας ὡς πρόβατα τὸν λαόν σου) by the hand of Moses and Aaron'. Isaiah also recalled Moses as shepherd deliverer and charismatic leader of Israel,

> the days of old, of Moses his servant. Where is the one who brought them up out of the sea with the shepherds of his flock? (ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων) Where is the one who put within them his holy spirit (τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον), who caused his glorious arm to march at the right hand of Moses... (Is 63:11).

---

[60] HALOT|874 אֲשֶׁר II d) giving consequence, *so that*.
[61] HALOT|6075 עֵדָה I 4. *congregation* (of Isr) 1K 8:5 & oft.

Moses, as shepherd, was the under-shepherd who was used by God to be the deliverer of Israel and the law-giver of Israel. For Matthew, Jesus will also be depicted as the shepherd deliverer (e.g. Mt 2:6 quoting Mic 5:2 and II Sam 5:2) and the authoritative interpreter of the law of Israel (e.g. Mt 5:18-20; 7:28-29).

We have looked at the Moses/exodus tradition and how it influenced the shepherd/sheep metaphor. Another tradition that informs the shepherd/sheep motif is the royal Davidic tradition, the righteous ruler, and ultimately of God's Messiah. We now focus on the importance of David in regard to the shepherd image.

5.2.3 David: The Shepherd King[62]

David is remembered in many ways: shepherd,[63] musician - the Psalmist of Israel,[64] warrior,[65] and King.[66] But the legacy of David as a 'genuine shepherd' continued to abide in the memory of Israel. In a long recital of Israel's story (Psalm 78), the people of God are reminded to learn from their past, not repeat the same mistakes and bring to remembrance the great promises given to David in Psalm 78:70-72:

> He chose his servant David and took him from the sheepfolds; from tending the nursing ewes he brought him to be the shepherd of his people Jacob, of Israel his inheritance. With upright heart he tended them and guided them with skillful hands.

This 'upright heart' is basic to the memory of David. We learn more about David, the under-shepherd of *YHWH* in portions of I Samuel:

> But David said to Saul, "Your servant has been keeping his father's sheep. When a lion or a bear came and carried off a sheep from the flock, I went after it, struck it and rescued the sheep from its mouth. When it turned on me, I seized it by its hair, struck it and killed it. Your servant has killed both the lion and the

---

[62] E.g. I Sam 16:11-13; 17:34-37; II Sam 5:1-2; 7:7; 24:17; Ps. 78:70-72.
[63] I Sam 16:1-13, 17:34-37.
[64] I Sam 16:14-23; 19:9. I Chr 16:4, 37.
[65] I Sam 18:13-16, 30.
[66] In II Sam 5:2 comes in anticipation of the word of the Lord through the prophet Nathan to David that he would 'shepherd my people Israel', 7:4ff (vv 7, 9).

> bear; this uncircumcised Philistine will be like one of them, because he has defied the armies of the living God". (I Sam. 17:20-24, 26, 32-40, 45)

There are two points in the narrative that feature David the shepherd. First, he does not leave the flock without providing for its proper care, 'David left the flock with a shepherd' (v 20). Second, as a faithful shepherd he protects the sheep from the dangers and enemies of the flock, 'Your servant has been keeping his father's sheep. When a lion or bear came and carried off a sheep from the flock, I went after it, struck it and rescued the sheep from its mouth' (v 35).

This kind of memory was nurtured among the people of God primarily because of the promise given to David by Nathan, the prophet, in II Sam. 7:5-17.

> Now then, tell my servant David, "This is what the LORD Almighty says: I took you from the pasture and from following the flock to be ruler over my people Israel. I have been with you wherever you have gone, and I have cut off all your enemies from before you. Now I will make your name great, like the names of the greatest men of the earth."

In II Samuel, this is repeated 'You will shepherd my people Israel, and you will become their ruler' (5:2) and 'I took you from the pasture and from following the flock to be ruler over my people Israel' (7:8).

In Matthew's Gospel, II Sam 5:2b and Micah 5:2 will be referenced in the compound quotation of Matthew 2:6 in the story of the magi. Jesus as the Son of David, the Messiah according to his Davidic linage will also be the true shepherd of Israel. As the Davidic shepherd of Israel he will demonstrate his royal status with integrity and righteousness as a shepherd after God's own heart. II Sam 5:2 is the nearest verbal reference in the biblical tradition that gives the title of *shepherd* to a human leader of Israel. This title, as noted, is reserved for *YHWH:*

עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל אַתָּה תִרְעֶה אֶת־עַמִּי אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאַתָּה תִּהְיֶה לְנָגִיד[67]

σὺ ποιμανεῖς τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ισραηλ καὶ σὺ ἔσει εἰς ἡγούμενον ἐπὶ τὸν Ισραηλ

David was remembered, in spite of his shortcomings, as doing 'what was right in the eyes of the Lord, and had not failed to keep any of the Lord's commands all the days of his life--except in the case of Uriah the Hittite' (I Kgs. 15:5). This is consistent with David's epitaph as a 'man after God's own heart'.[68]

Related to this royal Davidic tradition is Psalm 72.[69] Psalm 72 is alluded to by Matthew in the story of the magi and will have a number of intertextual possibilities when Matthew 2:1-11 is examined in chapter 7. The royal psalms[70] honor the king but always in the context of *YHWH* as the ultimate king of Israel. Just as *YHWH* is the ultimate shepherd so also *YHWH* has ultimate kingship.[71] An important theme in Psalm 72, which is also emphasized by the prophets (cf. e.g. Ez 34:16),[72] are the qualities of righteousness (צדק, vv 1-3, 7) and justice (מִשְׁפָּט, vv 1-2). The royal tradition will emphasize that the Messiah will restore justice and righteousness. These characteristics are celebrated as qualities that will characterize the Shepherd Messiah whom God will send.[73]

---

[67] HALOT5357 נָגִיד: chief, leader, sovereign, prince. Cf. Glück (1963) 144-150, who argues that 'the words *nagid* נָגִיד and *noqed* נֹקֵד are etymologically related and that *nagid* means "shepherd". However, through a natural transfiguration, "shepherd" became first, an attribute of the title of the ruler and later, synonym for the title itself....we can claim that *ngd* and *nqd* are variants of one expression...The primary root meant shepherd or shepherding in the broader sense, i.e. it embraces all the functions of his work. Gradually, as the language developed, the different aspects of the shepherd's work lent secondary meanings...Oversee, guide, go in front, feed, mark (from marking the sheep) etc.' 144-145.

[68] Cf. I Sam 13:14. In Jer 3:15 David is not explicitly mentioned but 'shepherds after my own heart, who will lead you with knowledge and understanding'. Cf. N.T. Acts 13:22, 'After removing Saul, he made David their king. He testified concerning him: 'I have found David son of Jesse a man after my own heart; he will do everything I want him to do'.

[69] Broyles (1999) 23-40; Kraus (1993) 2:74-81; Laniak (2006) 108-110.

[70] E.g. Ps 2; 18; 20; 21; 45; 72; 101; 110; 144.

[71] Laniak (2006) 109.

[72] E.g. Ez 34:16, 'I [*YHWH*] will feed them with justice (מִשְׁפָּט)'.

[73] Cf. Jer 23:5-6; Ez 34:23-24; 37:24-26.

These Davidic traditions along with the Moses/exodus tradition will be expanded in the prophets. Thus, we will now turn out attention to the prophetic tradition's use of the shepherd/sheep metaphor.

5.2.4 The Shepherd-Messiah and the False Shepherds of Israel

The most developed use of the shepherd/sheep metaphor occurs in later prophets: the pre-exilic prophet Jeremiah, the exilic prophet Ezekiel and the post-exilic prophet Zechariah. They represent both some of the most exalted images of the shepherd and in contrast illustrate the darkest side of the anti-shepherds of Israel's tradition. The crisis in leadership created by the destruction of Jerusalem in 587/6 B.C.E. and its aftermath was the context from which the prophetic tradition concerning the evil shepherd emerged. It is in this period when the shepherd metaphor also becomes a negative image describing unfaithful and abusive leadership in Israel. Jeremiah's prophecies influence and inform Ezekiel, then Jeremiah and Ezekiel influence Zechariah who in turn, along with them, influence the tradition of early Judaism during the Second Temple period. Before looking at these later prophets we want to briefly look at the shepherd metaphor in Micah with especial attention to the Shepherd text in 5:1-4.

5.2.4.1 Micah

The eighth century prophet Micah develops the shepherd/sheep metaphor in two principal references: Micah 5:1-4 and Micah 7:14.[74] Micah 7:14-17 is a prayer to *YHWH* asking for him to provide and protect for 'the flock that belongs to you'. The petitionary prayer begins by focusing on the need for pasture and a place to feed (v 14) and then turns to request protection against the nations (v 16). The shepherd metaphor is

[74] Mays (1976) 21-33 on dating and formation of the book.

associated with the Moses/exodus tradition when he prays, 'As in the days when you came out of the land of Egypt show us marvelous things' (v 15). The appeal is a characteristic appeal to *YHWH,* as shepherd.

In the royal Davidic tradition, Micah 5:1-4 refers to the eschatological shepherd/ruler who will come. The oracle moves from distress (v 1) to the hope that a ruler will come with authority to rule 'whose origin is from of old' (v 2). In his coming, the ruler will provide both strength and provision (v 4). His power will allow the people to 'live secure, for now he shall be great to the ends of the earth (v 4b); and 'he shall be the one of peace' (v 5).

In the larger context, this oracle changes the focuses onto this royal figure. Earlier, the focus has been upon the people and Zion (4:8f). There is now a shift from place to a person. The royal Davidic tradition expressed here is similar to what we saw above with David as the prototypical royal leader and the royal psalms with their description of his qualities of rule. Fulfillment of the prescribed qualities of rule or failure of the king's rule directly affects the people's existence. Confidence in the shepherd-ruler indicates confidence in the reign of *YHWH* the shepherd of Israel. The crises of the situation, illustrated in the lament of v 1, calls for a new day and a new ruler.

In these two examples, the Moses/exodus and the royal Davidic traditions continue to influence the shepherd/sheep metaphor. A portion of Micah 5:2, 'But you, O Bethlehem of Ephrathah, who are one of the little clans of Judah, from you shall come forth for me one who is to rule in Israel,' will be quoted by Matthew in 2:6. The royal Davidic background of this oracle will be assumed by Matthew in order to further substantiate Jesus' royal linage.

As we consider the later prophets, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Zechariah, these two traditions continue. But the prophetic tradition also illustrates a further dimension to the shepherd/sheep metaphor: the unfaithful or evil shepherd. To that image, we will turn.

5.2.4.2 Jeremiah

Jeremiah uses the shepherd/sheep metaphor throughout his prophetic work. It is with Jeremiah that the motif has not only a positive use but also is used as a negative expression. *YHWH* remains the true shepherd and under-shepherds with his character (after my own heart, Jer 3:15) will be raised up. They will replace the evil shepherds that have led the people astray and have not tended to the peoples needs (e.g. 2:8; 10:21; 23:1-2a; 25:34-36). There are two longer prophetic words (23:1-8; 25:34-38) along with a number of other references that utilize this image. In Jeremiah 25:34-38, the prophet holds out no hope for the evil shepherds, 'for the days of your slaughter have come'. Sheep who have been led away to the slaughter (cf. Is 53:7) are no longer considered the victims. Instead, judgment has come upon the abusive anti-shepherds.[75] Also in Jeremiah 23:1-6, the evil shepherds are judged (23:1-2b). But in contrast, *YHWH* 'will attend' to the evil shepherds (23:23) but will then 'gather...bring them back...and will raise up shepherds (plural) over them who will shepherd them...' (23:4). However, the promise of help and restoration does not stop there. The promise includes a Davidic Messiah. The Lord promises, 'I will raise up for David a righteous Branch, he shall reign...deal wisely ...execute justice and righteousness...in his days...will be saved...will live in safety'. The Messiah will be called 'The Lord is our righteousness' (23:5-7).

---

[75] Cf. Is 15:1, 3.

The character of this individual becomes by the time of Matthew the messiah who is characterized by a royal righteousness. The Messiah will be from the Davidic lineage, a king who will wisely and justly dispense righteousness in order that peace and safety will result. This is the kind of royal righteous status that Matthew claims for Jesus according to the shepherd metaphor. For example, in Matthew 2:6, the newborn king of the Jews is presented as coming from the royal lineage of David and it is anticipated that he will rule in righteousness. In Matthew 9:36, Jesus observes the crowds with compassion and says they are 'like sheep without a shepherd' or those without righteous leadership ('harrased and helpless'). In 9:36, compassion and justice will come together to characterize the shepherd. It will be argued that Jeremiah 3:15 and 23:4 (shepherds, plural, after the *YHWH's* heart will be raised up) are being alluded to in Matthew 9:36-10:1ff, where Jesus begins to 'raise up or give shepherds' to take the same message and ministry of the kingdom to the 'lost sheep of the house of Israel' (Mt 10:6).[76]

Jeremiah uses the image to include religious and political leaders of differing kinds, exercising different levels of religious and secular influence and authority. By Jeremiah's time the shepherd image was a well-established metaphor for leadership and could describe different kinds of leaders. The normal use of the metaphor was applied to secular rulers/leaders, as is illustrated in Jer 2:8. Even the commanders of an enemy from the north are described as shepherds (cf. 6:3; 12:10; cf. 13:20). In Israel this secular/religious distinction should not be strictly dichotomized because the kings/rulers/leaders were expected to rule as *YHWH* would rule; the rule of the under-shepherds was to reflect the rule of the shepherd of Israel, *YHWH*.

---

[76] So, the message of Jesus in Mt 4:17b and the message of the disciples in Mt 10:7b are to be the same. Also, the ministry of Jesus as described in 4:23 and 9:35, and illustrated in chapters 5-7 (words) and chapters 8-9 (works) becomes the same ministry commission of Jesus to the disciples in 10:1 and 10:8.

In Jeremiah 2:5-8 three or four groups of leaders are described. The pericope begins with a rhetorical question that asks 'what wrong did your ancestors find in me [God]...?' allowing the prophet to assert the fault of the people and maintain the blamelessness of God. The exodus/wilderness/conquest motif is introduced in vv 6-7 to emphasize the loss of spiritual memory (Deut 8:2, 11-20) and to stress the fact that the question they should have been asking, 'Where is the Lord?' (vv 6, 8) was no longer being considered by people, priest, shepherd (ruler) or prophet. While the people are at fault, Jeremiah 2:8 highlights the fact that the leaders of the people, religious and secular, were ultimately responsible for the current situation.

2:8: The priests (כֹּהֵן, ἱερεύς) did not say, "Where is the LORD?"
Those who handle the law (priests or another group, scribes?) did not know me;
the rulers (רעה, ποιμήν) transgressed against me;
the prophets (נָבִיא, προφήτης) prophesied by Baal,
and went after things that do not profit.[77]

The question is how many groups are being described in 2:8; three or four? Also, does the final colon refer back to the groups described or to the people generally? Linguistically it may be argued that since the verb follows each of the four subjects, the verse points to four groups. The final phrase in v 8 refers back to the three/four preceding groups and not to the people.[78] Jeremiah does seem to make a distinction between the priests who, 'are the cultic mediators between Yahweh and the community,'[79] and a scribal group (among the Levites?) whose function it is to interpret the law in 8:8.[80] Jeremiah will condemn this group when he speaks of 'the

[77] Cf. Holladay 1:88 on the structure of the verse who proposes five cola as opposed to six.
[78] So Holladay 1:88. He discusses five possible interpretations for the relation of the different groups and the people. He argues for four groups and that the final colon refers back to the four groups rather than to the people.
[79] Holladay 1:88.
[80] Craigie (1991) 28-29 refers to them as the 'scholars' along with the priest, pastors and prophets when discussing 2:8; he later says they 'were probably Levites, some of whom were entrusted with the

false pen of the scribes (סֹפֵר, γραμματεύς)'.[81] The 'shepherds' or 'rulers' in this text were not primarily religious, as the other groups, but were the national leaders who were responsible for the people's security and welfare.

Jeremiah uses the shepherd motif to speak of those evil leaders who have rebelled and/or neglected to turn and trust in the Lord (2:8, (cf. v 26); 10:21; 23:1-3; 25:34-38; 50:6); in contrast were the good 'shepherds', again in the plural, who are the new shepherds that *YHWH* will raise up in order to give leadership to God's flock (Jer 3:15 (two times); 23:4 (two times); 43:12). This positive image of the shepherd is developed further in 23:5-6 using the David typology to point to a future single individual who will rule as a just and righteous shepherd king. Under this righteous shepherd king the people of God will live in secure pasture. This image is extended again in 33:12-17; vv 15-16 are dependent on 23:5-6.[82] The metaphor points to the function of God's shepherd. He will gather the people who have been scattered (Jer 31:10) and will then extend his work through these 'shepherds after my own heart' (Jer 3:15, 23:4). Through these shepherds, *YHWH* will provide and care for the people throughout the land, the place of the Lord's pasture (Jer 31:10-14, 33:12-16).

In addition to the shepherd texts mentioned above, there are others that could be discussed.[83] However, for the purpose of this thesis, I will focus on three remaining passages that are of particular interest: Jeremiah 3:15, 23:1-6 and 50:6.

---

business of religious education'.

[81] Holladay 1:89.

[82] Holladay 2:228-229, notes that while 33:14-26 is not found in the LXX, he argues on the basis of content and Hebrew style that the passage should be assigned to the postexilic period.

[83] For example, in 17:16a Jeremiah may refer to himself as a shepherd, but the text is difficult and awkward to translate:

But I have not run away from being a shepherd in your service
ἐγὼ δὲ οὐκ ἐκοπίασα κατακολουθῶν ὀπίσω σου
וְאֲנִי לֹא־אַצְתִּי מֵרֹעֶה אַחֲרֶיךָ

Yet, the meaning is understandable if Jeremiah is saying he has not 'run away' from God's call, even though he feels it has been difficult. Jer 17:14-18 is a confession of Jeremiah and has his characteristic

The importance of Jeremiah 3:15 and 50:6 for this study has to do with the promise that *YHWH* will raise up 'shepherds' (3:15, plural) to replace the evil shepherds who have 'led astray' the people (50:6). It will be argued in Chapter 7 that these two verses are alluded to in regard to Matthew 9:36. The promise in Jeremiah 3:15 is that *YHWH* will raise up new shepherds who will replace the evil shepherds (50:6), those who have not tended to and have even led astray God's people. The context of Matthew 9:36 is Jesus 'raising up' and sending out his disciples to the 'lost sheep of the house of Israel' (Mt 10:6) in response to the crowds who are 'harassed and helpless' because of the current Jewish leadership.

Jeremiah 23:1-6 is important in the development of the shepherd/sheep metaphor in the exilic and post-exilic prophets. It will be argued below that Ezekiel 34 is shaped by this passage. The chiastic structure of the first oracle, verses 1-4, emphasize *YHWH's* judgment on the evil shepherds and his deliverance of the people/flock.[84] The evil shepherds have not 'tended to' (qal stem, פקד) the people but now God will 'tend to' them (qal stem, פקד) in judgment and then will raise up shepherds who will 'tend to' (niphal stem, פקד) the flock of God.

A You (shepherds) scattered my flock (v 1)
  B and thrust out them, and did not attend to them (v 2a)
    C I (*YHWH*) will attend to you (v 2b)
  B' I myself will gather, bring back my flock to their fold (v 3)
A' I will raise up shepherds who will tend to/shepherd the flock (v 4)

The triple use of the verb 'tend' (פקד) in vs 2 (2 times) and vs 4 show what the shepherds have done and what *YHWH* will do. To 'tend' (פקד) is the verb that holds the oracle together. The verb has a wide usage, but in I Sam 11:8 it means to 'number' therefore implying here that *YHWH's* way of 'tending' the sheep is 'to look after them

---

phrases of personal lament. For a full discussion and alternative readings cf. Holladay 1:505-506.
[84] Cragie (1991) 325.

one by one, and this the kings have not done with their people'.[85] The last occurrence implies that under the new shepherd's attention the flock will not be missing or lacking (niphal stem, פקד).

The 'fold' metaphor (נָוֶה, lit. 'grazing place') can be, on the one hand, used in a judgment oracle—for example, the evil or foreign shepherds come and destroy Judah (Jer 6:2). On the other hand, this usage describes how the sheep will be restored to their pasture. The final two words of vs 3, 'be fruitful and multiply' (וּפָרוּ וְרָבוּ), refer back to both creation (Gen 1:22, 28; וּרְבוּ וּמִלְאוּ) and to the exodus (Ex 1:7, מְאֹד מְאֹד וַתִּמָּלֵא בִּמְאֹד). So, with this language Jeremiah is proleptically appealing for a new creation and a new exodus when *YHWH* will initiate a new beginning and raise up new leadership to shepherd his people.

The pericope begins in judgment but ends in salvation and restoration. Under the new shepherds there will no longer be any fear (ירא, cf. Ps 23:24). In the presence of *YHWH* there is no fear.[86]

The second oracle is different than the first in that it emphasizes the royal figure rather than the deliverance of the people/flock. Jeremiah may have been inspired by Isaiah 11:1-9; there are a number of similar themes. The connections are noteworthy in light of the way the royal messianic theme is developed.[87] In both passages: 1) David is the source of this promised righteous and royal individual (Is 11:1; Jer 23:5);

---

[85] Holladay 1:614.
[86] Craigie (1991) 327.
[87] The following connections between this passage and Is 11:1-9 are developed from Craigie (1991) 329.

2) His royal reign will be characterized by a special awareness of God (Is 11:2; Jer 23:5); 3) The wise and righteous rule of this royal individual will be a just rule (Is 11:2-5; Jer 23:5); 4) There is deliverance of the people and the promise of the return/restoration of the people (Is 11:6-9; Jer 23:6); 5) A descriptive 'naming' is introduced by the prophets (Is 9:6; Jer 23:6) and 6)The royal-righteousness of this promised deliverer is a shared theme between both prophets.

This passage, 23:5-6, also has a chiastic structure:

A God will raise up a legitimate/righteous ruler (v 5a-c)
  B This king will reign with success/prosperity and righteousness (v 5d)
    C He will bring justice and righteousness (v 5e-f)
  B' Judah/Israel will be delivered and safe (v 6a-b)
A' God will call him '*YHWH* our righteousness' (v 6c-d)[88]

Similar to the previous oracle, there is a triple reference with reference to righteousness (צדק). Referred to three times (23:5a, 23:5b, and 23:6b) righteousness is the theme that holds this oracle together. The use of צדק in this passage may be used by Jeremiah to indicate different dimensions of this one whom God will raise up from David's line. The implication of a double meaning, a 'rightful and/or righteous branch/sprout' would be typical of Jeremiah.[89] He will be the rightful descendent of David and the righteous ruler on behalf of *YHWH.* This emphasis continues the theme that this future Davidic Messiah will rule with justice and righteousness. Many consider the 'righteous branch' (צֶמַח צַדִּיק) to be a technical term referring to the rightful heir of an established dynastic line—in Israel, a future Davidic king who would restore the monarchy with a future individual who will bring hope to the

[88] Craigie (1991) 329.
[89] So Craigie (1991) 330; Holladay 1:617-618; Laniak (2006) 137-138.

circumstances of Jeremiah.[90] Specifically, relating to this study, for Matthew Jesus will fulfill this quality of rightness and righteousness.

In sum, Jeremiah in his prophecies brings together the two traditions of exodus/wilderness/conquest and the royal Davidic Messiah as they relate to the shepherd/sheep metaphor. What Jeremiah has also contributed to the tradition is the reality of the evil shepherds who by their behavior abuse and scatter the flock of God's people. The added dimension of the problem of evil shepherds is overcome by Jeremiah in the promises of God. *YHWH* will raise up good shepherds 'after his own heart' (3:15, 23:4) but he will himself shepherd his people again through a promised Shepherd-Messiah. The Shepherd-Messiah will deliver (23:5-6, ישע, to save or deliver)[91] and 'will be called: "The Lord is our righteousness."'. The influence of Jeremiah was considerable.[92] The emergence of the evil shepherd metaphor would influence many who follow Jeremiah. Not least the prophet of the exile Ezekiel. It is to Ezekiel 34 that we now turn our attention.

5.2.4.3 Ezekiel

Ezekiel uses the exodus/wilderness/conquest motif to explore the meaning of the exile but will also include the ultimate expression of hope in the Davidic Messiah (e.g. Ez 34: 23-24). Promises for the future only emerge after the judgment of the present and the present judgment is directed at Judah's rulers in Ezekiel 34.[93] The hinge in the structure of Ezekiel's book is chapter 33, which includes both a recapitulation of his message and anticipation of his prophecies to be given in 34-48. Ezekiel 34 introduces these prophecies which are characterized by hope in the midst of the exile because in a

---

[90] Bright (1965) 143; Craigie (1991) 331; Holladay 1:618; Laniak (2006) 137-138.
[91] LXX; σωθήσεται, fut. ind. pass.
[92] Cf. Holladay 2:70-98, on the impact of Jeremiah on his own and later generations.
[93] Laniak (2006) 145-146, 150.

new time there will be new leadership. The evil shepherds and their behavior will be judged by *YHWH* and he himself will shepherd his people (34:11-16) and will 'set up over them one shepherd, my servant David' (34:23-24).

It is generally acknowledged that Ezekiel utilizes and often expands the images and themes of former prophets.[94] Ezekiel reveals that Jeremiah has influenced Ezekiel in at least twenty-five or more ways.[95] In Ezekiel 34, the prophet appropriates for his own purposes the inspiration of Jeremiah 23 and extends the metaphor of the shepherd/sheep. Again there is a common consensus that this is Ezekiel's practice. Regarding the question as to whether Jeremiah 23 has influenced Ezekiel 34, the consensus is that the one text has influenced the other. The real question and debate has to do with the extent to which Ezekiel is directly dependent upon Jeremiah. It is generally agreed that Jeremiah 23 intertextually shapes Ezekiel 34. Both prophets utilize and develop the tradition of both the royal Davidic tradition and the exodus/wilderness/conquest tradition. My approach to the relationship between the two texts has been influenced by the work of the scholars listed below, especially J. Lust and W. Zimmerli.[96]

Ezekiel 34 may be divided into four pericopes with parallels to Jeremiah 23. The denunciation of the evil shepherds in Jeremiah 23:1-2 parallels the expanded indictment of the corrupt shepherds in Ezekiel 34:1-10. In response, God will shepherd his people as described in Jeremiah 23:3 and extended in Ezekiel 34:11-15(16). Ezekiel 34:16(17)-24 may be paralleled by Jeremiah 23:4-5 where ultimately

---

[94] Cf. Zimmerli 1:42-46 for the influence of the prophetic tradition; for Deut and Lev 46-52. The metallurgical imagery of Ez 22:17-22 may well have been inspired by Is 1:22, 25, while the sexual allegory of 23:2-27 may well be a further development of Jer 3:6-11.

[95] Holladay 2:81-84, without trying to be comprehensive identifies twenty-five references to Jeremiah alone in Ezekiel. Jer 23:1-2(3-8) may well be the source of the shepherd metaphor in Ezekiel 34 who would often embellish and develop according to his own purposes. Whether he uses the whole of the pericope in Jer 23 or only parts of it he continues his practice of developing themes that he has received in the biblical tradition.

[96] Cf. Allan (1990) 154-165; Holladay 1:81-84; Lust (1981)119-142; Zimmerli 2:214.

God will provide the people one shepherd, 'my servant David' who 'shall be prince among them'. Finally, Jeremiah 23:7-8 may be associated with Ezekiel 34:26-31 where there are no direct verbal linkages but where the exodus/wilderness/conquest tradition may be discerned.[97] The point of the possible intertextuality between the two passages points out connections to the shepherd/sheep metaphor. Jeremiah influences Ezekiel and Ezekiel will influence others. Thus, through the prophetic tradition of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, in spite of the evil shepherds, God promises to do a new thing by rising up good shepherds and by sending a Shepherd-Messiah to care for his people. This biblical tradition was utilized by Matthew who considers the shepherd/sheep metaphor to inform and substantiate his understanding of Jesus. So, along with Jeremiah, Matthew 9:36 will allude to Ezekiel 34:4-8 (Cf. Mt 15:24). Matthew 25:32 draws upon Ezekiel 34:17, 20-24. Matthew 26:31-32, while quoting Zechariah 13:7, is intertextually related to Ezekiel 34:11-13.

Ezekiel 34 is one of the most extended, if not the most extended, use of the shepherd/sheep metaphor. The description of the failure of the bad shepherds is detailed by noting what they have selfishly taken (milk, wool, and meat) and then what they should have given as faithful shepherds of the flock. The prophet goes beyond the normal images of protection and provision by indicating a number of ways they have neglected the sheep: 1) they have not fed the flock, 2) they have not strengthened the weak 3) nor have they tended to the hurt, 4) they have not sought the strays 5) nor have they tried to find the lost. Amidst this neglect, 6) they have treated

---

[97] Lust (1981) 139-142.

the sheep with 'force' (חֲזָקָה[98]) and 'harshness' (פָּרֶךְ[99]) (v 4). These actions result in the flock being scattered and vulnerable to becoming food for wild animals with none to care or protect them (34:2-6).

In response to this situation *YHWH* will personally intervene (34:10-16). In Ezekiel 34:15-16, *YHWH* will do for the sheep all the things that the evil shepherds have neglected: feed, provide good pasture, seek the lost, bring back the stray, bind up the injured, and strengthen the weak. This promise of hope is introduced because *YHWH* will shepherd his people. Many of the metaphorical themes and images in these verses are similar to and consistent with those of Psalm 23. Along with the pastoral images is God's promise that by his presence he will rescue them from 'a day of...deep darkness' (vs. 12). *YHWH* as Shepherd is present here even as his presence is promised in Ps. 23: 4.

In the remainder of the chapter, the focus shifts away from the shepherds/leaders to the sheep/people (34:17-22). In 34:23-24, the focus shifts away from *YHWH* as Shepherd to the Messiah who will be 'placed over' the sheep as the good shepherd who 'will tend' God's flock 'in safety'. The task of shepherding the people is committed to 'one shepherd, my servant David'. In Ezekiel 34:23-24 and the parallel passage in 37:24-25, the prophet brings together a number of images to highlight this individual: 1) king (מלך); 2) shepherd (רעה); 3) servant (עבד) and 4) prince (נָשִׂיא). Prince (נָשִׂיא) is a preferred way Ezekiel likes to speak of leaders,[100] but it also harkens back to the

---

[98] HALOT2785חֲזָקָה: strength, by force. The term is used in the I Sam 2:16 concerning the actions of Eli's two sons whose sin 'was very great in the sight of the Lord, for they treated the offerings of the Lord with contempt'. 2:17.

[99] Used in Ex 1:13 of how ruthless the Egyptians treated the children of Israel.

[100] HALOT 37 times.

wilderness and to Numbers where pre-monarchical leaders are described.[101] The chapter concludes with the attending blessings of 'a covenant of peace' (34:25-31). The background to this covenant of peace[102] is Leviticus 26:5-6. The passage echoes the blessings of the Sinai covenant which will be provided by *YHWH.* Finally, vs 31 concludes 'You are my sheep, the sheep of my pasture, and I am your God which is an allusion to Jeremiah 23:1 (צֹאן מַרְעִיתִי) 'the sheep that I tend/the sheep of my pasture'.

Through this extension of the shepherd/sheep metaphor in Ezekiel 34, the function of the shepherd is more fully detailed both by describing the negligence of the evil shepherds and by describing the ways God will shepherd his people. The focus for Ezekiel is less on new shepherds being raised up, as in Jeremiah. Rather, the focus for Ezekiel is on how *YHWH* will shepherd and on his promise to shepherd through the eschatological David. The visions of both Jeremiah and of Ezekiel will set the stage for prophecies of Zechariah. Like his predecessors, Zechariah will also focus on leadership. In Zechariah 9-14 the shepherd/sheep metaphor is a primary way he communicates his prophecy. To those chapters we now turn.

5.2.4.4 Zechariah[103]

Zechariah 9:1 and 12:1 both introduce the two oracles that make up chapters 9-14. The shepherd/sheep metaphor occurs throughout these six chapters. Israel is referred to as 'the flock of his people' in 9:16. Additionally, the shepherd/sheep metaphor occurs in Zechariah 10:2-3 and 13:7 but the major concentration of shepherd texts are in chapter 11. In chapter 11, the metaphor is developed or extended in yet another way where the prophet is told by God to 'Be a shepherd of the flock doomed to slaughter' (11:4). He is

[101] HALOT 62 times. Laniak (2006) 159-160.
[102] Found only in Num 25:12; Is 54:10; Ez 37:26 and here.
[103] Myers & Myers (1993) 42; 195; 290; 385 note Zechariah is intertextualy related to, among other texts, I Kgs 22:17; Jer 23:1-4; 25:34-38; Ez 34:1-23; 37:25-27; *pace* Holladay 2:89 who does not see any influence of Jeremiah on Zechariah 9-14.

to be a good shepherd in contrast to the existing shepherds who exploit the people. The prophet obeys by tending the sheep with his two staffs, Favor and Unity (11:7). He removes the three evil shepherds but the sheep are not appreciative of his efforts (11:8-9) and so he becomes frustrated and breaks his staffs and asks to be paid (11:10-11). He is paid the amount a slave owner would pay for a slave who had been gored to death by a neighbor's ox.[104] The postexilic prophet presents a 'good' shepherd, in contrast to the wicked shepherds, who are to be judged. Then he is rejected by the people and the rejection of the shepherd prophet is also a rejection of *YHWH.* God then puts over them another evil shepherd to judge them (11:15-17). [105]

The good shepherd is both pierced (12:10) and then in Zechariah 13:7 he is struck a fatal blow with the sword. There is a contrast with the shepherd here and the 'worthless shepherd' in 11:17 where the sword does not inflict a mortal injury, just the arm and the right eye.[106] In chapter 11, the shepherd prophet is not able to turn the people to *YHWH* and the judgment falls on evil shepherds and people as well through the reestablishment of the evil shepherd. Yet the judgment does not stop with the shepherds (10:2-3; 11:15-17) but will also rest upon *YHWH's* shepherd ('my shepherd' in Zech 13:7ff).[107] Through his representative and willing death, the people of God's future are transformed and the Lord's salvation is brought about (13:1-9). The shepherd is willing to pay the ultimate price in providing the salvation and deliverance of the sheep. In these opening verses of Zechariah 13:1-9, the promise is that God will provide cleansing for 'the house of David'. Earlier in the oracle the Davidic tradition

---

[104] Cf. Ex 21:23
[105] Duguid (1995) 270-275.
[106] Meyers & Meyers (1993) 384; 291, 'These two body parts together symbolize the shepherd's autonomy, that is, his ability to do whatever it is that he does in the world'. Therefore, the shepherd has neither strength to rule nor any capacity 'to see' or to know in any kind of discerning way, and especially to see 'rightly'.
[107] Baldwin (1975) 197.

has emerged in Zechariah 12:7, 8, 10, 12 and now in 13:1. Commentators wonder about the nature of the shepherd here: is he royal (?) priestly (?) prophetic (?) or leadership generally (?).[108] The reality is that in these chapters leadership has been criticized in both civic and religious spheres.[109] The usage of Zechariah blurs the usage of the shepherd metaphor further. In Jeremiah it was the kings of Israel, especially the kings who led them into exile. In Ezekiel this is also the predominate perspective. Yet by the time of Zechariah the shepherd metaphor, while still portraying kings and civic rulers, also portrays those in 'semi-religious' leadership roles, those depicted as spiritual leaders such as prophets.[110]

In light of the focus of the shepherd metaphor in Matthew there are two primary texts of interest in Zechariah, 10:2-3 and 13:7. The latter text is quoted in the passion narrative in Matthew 26:31 anticipating the death of Jesus. Zechariah 10:2 is to be considered in relation to Matthew 9:36. 10:2 is probably not a direct allusion in 9:36 but it is related to the intertextual links starting with Numbers 27:17. While not intertextually related, it may be that Jesus understood his own ministry to be like the shepherd prophet of Zechariah 11.[111]

---

[108] Meyers & Meyers (1993) 290, 'Throughout the narrative of 11:4-16, "shepherd" may represent "prophet" as well as other leaders, inasmuch as Second Zechariah is called upon to act the shepherd role. Second Zechariah is the good shepherd, i.e., true prophet, of verses 4-14; and the "foolish shepherd" of verses 15 and 16 is the "worthless shepherd", who is presented in language that echoes the story of the deceitful prophet of I Kings'.

[109] Laniak (2006) 169.

[110] Meyers & Meyers (1993) 290. Jeremiah may identify himself as a shepherd: Jer 17:11, 'But I have not run away from being a shepherd (לֹא־אַצְתִּי מֵרֹעֶה אַחֲרֶיךָ, ἐγὼ δὲ οὐκ ἐκοπίασα κατακολουθῶν ὀπίσω σου) in your service...'. Heb. 'I have not been quick to depart from shepherding behind you...'. While the Hebrew is vague, it does use רעה. But note the LXX translation of the Heb. 'I have not become weary of following behind you...' yet, 'following behind' (LXX, κατακολουθῶν) may have shepherd implications. Many of the translations try to indicate the shepherd possibility: NRSV; NASB; NIV-UK; KJV. *Pace* Holladay 1:504-507 who understands it to be a wedding metaphor concerning the best man.

[111] Cf. Jeremias *TDNT* 6:492-493; Tooley (1964) 18-19; Bruce (1968) 105-106; Baldwin (1975) 198; France (1971) 103, 107.

5.3 Summary

In Chapter 5, we have reviewed the different traditions in the OT that inform and shape the development of the shepherd/sheep metaphor. Throughout the tradition, *YHWH* alone is the ultimate shepherd of Israel. By extension of the metaphor, the people are the sheep of his pasture. The shepherd image is a natural one for Israel due to the heritage of the patriarchs who themselves were shepherds. Springing from the background of Genesis are two primary traditions that inform the shepherd/sheep metaphor throughout the biblical tradition. The first is the Moses/exodus tradition, which emphasizes the exodus/wilderness/conquest. This tradition functions to show how *YHWH* is a shepherd to his people Israel and Moses is the prototype leader within this tradition. The second important tradition that informs the metaphor is the royal Davidic tradition of the Monarchy with David as the prototype. Emerging from the royal tradition will be the hope of an eschatological David who will be God's Messiah-Shepherd. The under-shepherds of Israel are to reflect the shepherd qualities of *YHWH* in their leadership. We conclude this review of the OT by noting that along with the Moses/exodus and royal David traditions, a third tradition emerged as a result of the later prophets; that of the unfaithful or evil shepherd. The negative use of the metaphor is used by the prophetic tradition to denounce unfaithful and evil leadership. This theme will continue through Second Temple Judaism into the NT. Finally, in Matthew 2 the Evangelist will contrast Jesus the royal-righteous shepherd who is born king of the Jews with the evil king Herod. Before we consider Matthew, we well examine some of the texts of Second Temple Judaism and the first century C.E.

CHAPTER 6
SHEPHERD/SHEEP METAPHOR IN EARLY JEWISH LITERATURE

6.1 Early Judaism

During the period of Second Temple Judaism the shepherd/sheep metaphor is less dominant in the biblical tradition, especially when compared to the later prophets Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Zechariah. During this period, the use of the metaphor generally follows the OT pattern.[1] The task of this chapter will be to examine the use of the metaphor during this period in light of the two primary traditions: the Moses/exodus tradition and the royal Davidic tradition. Also, attention will be given to the negative use of the metaphor in this period. It was noted in Chapter 5 that the negative use of the shepherd/sheep image is often associated with times of crisis and contested leadership. During the beginning of the period the shepherd/sheep metaphor was used with more reserve.[2] Possibly because shepherds were kings and the failure of the kings had played a large role in the exile. This stage in Israel's history was a tumultuous time and so the metaphor would re-emerge from about 200 B.C.E. and after.[3] In one sense, Israel was a people without a shepherd, looking for a good shepherd to come and deliver Israel from its oppressors and difficult circumstances. The influence of the Moses/exodus tradition and royal Davidic tradition would continue to give the people hope at different times during this period.

The anti-shepherd metaphor was also employed at times to describe the foreign occupation and the ruling 'shepherds'/leaders. The common theme that literal shepherds were not to be trusted may well have cast a suspicious light on all leadership during this period. By the time of the NT, the trade of shepherding has lost

---

[1] Vancil *ABD* 5:1190.
[2] Collins (1995) 33, 'We have very little evidence of messianism in Judaism in the period 500-200 B.C.E'.

most (if not all) of any prestige that might be associated with Israel's heritage among the patriarchs, Moses and David. The documentation shows that the occupation of the shepherd, not long after the NT period, was considered one of the 'despised trades'[4] and shepherds were known to be 'dishonest, [and] outside the Law'.[5] The extent to which this is the case in the first century will be considered below by examining some rabbinic materials.

Our analysis will involve noting the general time frame and the context of each shepherd/sheep reference, plus examining how the text is related to the biblical tradition. The significance of the author's use of the shepherd/sheep image will be investigated. In some cases, implications for Matthew's use of the metaphor will be considered.

6.1.1 Judith 11:19

11:19 Then I will lead you through Judea, until you come to Jerusalem; there I will set your throne. You will drive them like sheep that have no shepherd, and no dog will so much as growl at you.	καὶ ἄξω σε διὰ μέσου τῆς Ιουδαίας ἕως τοῦ ἐλθεῖν ἀπέναντι Ιερουσαλημ καὶ θήσω τὸν δίφρον σου ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς καὶ ἄξεις αὐτοὺς ὡς πρόβατα οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν ποιμήν καὶ οὐ γρύξει κύων τῇ γλώσσῃ αὐτοῦ ἀπέναντί σου

The reference in Judith 11:19b, 'You [Holofernes] will drive (ἄγω, lead) them [Israel] like sheep that have no shepherd (ὡς πρόβατα οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν ποιμήν)', and no dog will so much as growl at you', is intertextually related to Num 27:17 and Is 56:11. These two OT passages also refer to shepherd and sheep (Num) and shepherd and dogs (Is).

---

[3] E.g. Sirach 18:13 (ca. 180 BCE); Psalms of Solomon 17:43-46 (ca. 50 BCE). Jeremias *TDNT* 6:489.
[4] Cf. *m.Qidd.4:14*, '... A man should not teach his son to be an ass-driver or a camel-driver, or a barber or a sailor, or a herdsman or a shopkeeper, for their craft is the craft of robbers'.
[5] Brown (1988) 420-424, 427-431. Because the shepherd often worked alone, questions arose about honesty in regard to numbers of lambs born, how much wool had been sheared and other possible ways a shepherd might defraud the owner of the sheep.

The Judith narrative is often compared to the Esther story in terms of the role Judith plays as God's instrument of deliverance from foreign oppression. Judith is also compared with (her namesake), Judas Maccabeus. Whether the story is historical or to be 'regarded as a folktale' affects little the moral of the story of a devout Jewish woman whom, by her trust in God, defeats Israel's enemy and delivers her people.[6] The book is generally dated as early as 140 B.C.E., right after the time of Judas, to as late as 107 B.C.E. when it is assumed to have taken its final form.

In sum, Judith has gone into the enemy camp and by playing the role of prophetess promises (falsely) Holofernes, the Assyrian general, that he will be victorious. The story of Judith ends not with the fulfillment of the prophecy, but with Holofernes hoping to seduce Judith. Instead, he drinks too much wine and the heroine decapitates him. With the head of Holofernes publicly displayed, the Assyrians flee in defeat and the Israelites are led to victory by Judith's courage and trust in God.

The phrase, ὡς πρόβατα οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν ποιμήν, is part of an intertextual linkage that is important for this study. The comparison shows the linguistic similarities and discrepancies:

Num 27:17, ὡσεὶ πρόβατα οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν ποιμήν
I Kings 22:17, ὡς ποίμνιον ᾧ οὐκ ἔστιν ποιμήν
II Chron 18:16, ὡς πρόβατα οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν ποιμήν
Zech 10:2, ὡς πρόβατα καὶ ἐκακώθησαν διότι οὐκ ἦν ἴασις[7]
Jdt 11:19, ὡς πρόβατα οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν ποιμήν
Mt 9:36, ὡσεὶ πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα

The comparison shows that, while having some variation in vocabulary, the phrase has become a 'stock phrase' or proverbial phrase[8] indicating that Israel lacked leadership (e.g. deliverance, guidance, protection).

---

[6] Moore *ABD* 1121.

Within the Moses/exodus tradition the prophets declare that God guides, provides and promises a way through the wilderness and ultimately saves Israel (e.g. Is. 40:3-4; 42:16; 51:11). Strikingly, the 'oracle of salvation' (Jud 11:19) in the context of the Judith story is somewhat ironic in that she makes this declaration intentionally deceiving Holofernes. She further promises that the Lord 'will set your throne' in Jerusalem, continuing the deception with the imagery of the prophets concerning the favored kings of Israel (Cf. David in 2 Sam 7:13; Ps 89:4). Judith also mixes metaphors likening the shepherd to watchdogs that will not even growl, which is reminiscent of the phrase 'silent dogs that cannot bark' in Is. 56:10-11:

> Israel's sentinels are blind...they are all silent dogs that cannot bark; dreaming, lying down, loving to slumber. The dogs have a mighty appetite; they never have enough. The shepherds also have no understanding....

Note that both texts mix the metaphors of sheepdogs and shepherds. Israel's leaders are not only bad shepherds but bad sheepdogs that 'cannot bark' and warn of danger. The negligence of the leaders is also emphasized by a shepherd who is asleep. The negative association of Israel's leaders with shepherds is further heightened by calling them dogs. Dogs, like pigs, lived as scavengers in antiquity and in the biblical tradition are almost always spoken of with contempt. It is rare in the biblical tradition for sheepdogs to be associated with shepherds. Only here and Job 30:1 where it is also pejorative.

Judith 11:19 relies upon the Moses/exodus tradition to depict the need for leadership and on the prophetic tradition to speak of the shepherd pejoratively. The

---

[7] Zech 10:2 has the same motif, but shows the most difference in vocabulary: ὡς πρόβατα καὶ ἐκακώθησαν διότι οὐκ ἦν ἴασις *('suffer for lack of a shepherd')*. The sheep are injured/harmed because they are without healing (implying there is no shepherd).

[8] Cf. Prichard *ANET* 443a. A similar image already used of failing leadership by Ipu-wer (ca 2,200 BCE) 'like a herd running at random without a herdsman. Behold, cattle stray and there is none to collect them...'

use of the image is associated with a crisis or vacuum of leadership and Judith becomes God's leader (under-shepherdess).

6.1.2 Sirach (Ecclesiasticus) 18:13

The compassion of human beings is for their neighbors, but the compassion of the Lord is for every living thing. He rebukes and trains and teaches them, and turns them back, as a shepherd his flock.	ἔλεος ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ ἔλεος δὲ κυρίου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα ἐλέγχων καὶ παιδεύων καὶ διδάσκων καὶ ἐπιστρέφων ὡς ποιμὴν τὸ Ποίμνιον αὐτοῦ

In context (18:1-14), Ben Sira has been contrasting the strength and greatness of the Lord with humanity's frailty and weakness. This human frailty is 'why the Lord is patient with them and pours out his mercy upon them'(18:11). God's compassion (ἔλεος) is illustrated by utilizing the shepherd metaphor. Four functions of the shepherd are highlighted[9] 1) rebuking (ἐλέγχω, correction); 2) training (παιδεύω, discipline); 3) teaching (διδάσκω) and 4) turning back (ἐπιστρέφω).

Wisdom literature often uses the two verbs 'rebuking' and 'training' together in relation to fatherly correction or discipline (e.g., Prov 9:7f.; 3:11). Discipline is also associated with exodus and wilderness wanderings. So, the shepherd/sheep metaphor is again associated with the Moses/Exodus tradition (Lv 26:18, 23, 28; Dt 4:36; 8:5). The four actions are an expression of the shepherd's compassion for his flock and are to be understood as positive in contrast to the exercise of his punishment on those who refuse to follow him.

To summarize Sirach 18:13, the Lord 'turns them back' (lit. turns them around, ἐπιστρέφω) as a shepherd turns back the sheep. He does this for those who are willing to follow Him as the compassionate shepherd and those who are willing to 'accept his discipline and are eager for his precepts' (v 14).

[9] Each of the verbs are participles and are descriptive of the shepherds function/role.

6.1.3 LXX: Psalm 151 (11QPs[a] [10]:151A)

The textual relationship between the LXX versions (the Greek and Syriac) and the Hebrew version (11QPS[a]) of Psalm 151 has received much attention since its publication.[11] James A. Sanders assumed that the Hebrew version (11QPS[a]) was the original and that the LXX version 'was made from a truncated amalgamation of the two Hebrew psalms'.[12] After closer evaluation, the shorter text of the LXX is now taken to be earlier and the Hebrew version is the expanded version.[13] This conclusion is also consistent with text critical studies that generally indicate that a scribe is more prone to add, rather than omit, a text.

In 1988, Menaham Haran took issue with the assumption that the Hebrew version was the original and put forward an argument to establish the LXX as the 'priority' text.[14] He makes his argument on the basis of 'late (Hebrew)' and also what he argues is 'forced and artificial language'. He also identifies 'corrupt forms' of the language which made their way into the psalm's text.[15] In addressing the extra lines in 11QPs[a] , he noted that 'these "extra" parts include the passage comprising lines 5-8, over the interpretation of which scholars have been at odds, some thinking that Orphic motifs are discernable here, testifying to Hellenistic influence'.[16] His explanation for the 'extra' material is that it was a later addition, rather than being part of the original psalm. We will look primarily at the LXX keeping in mind the textual issues and ongoing discussion about Psalm 151.

---

[10] Charlesworth,ed. (1983-1985) 2: 609-616. Flint (1996) 65-83; Haran (1988) 171-182; Sanders (1967) 10-14, 93-103; (1974) 79-99; Smith (1997) 182-208; Storfjell (1987) 97-106; Strugnell (1965) 207-216; Wilson (1985) 63-92; and now more recently (1997) 448-464.
[11] Sanders (1963) 73-86; Sanders (1965); Sanders (1967).
[12] Sanders (1967) 95; Following his lead Schurer (1973) 3:188-189; Charlesworth and Sanders (1985) 2:609-616; Evans (1992) 36.
[13] This is the general consensus but Cf. esp. Menahem (1988) and Smith (1997). The following observations are made in light of their perspective.
[14] Menaham (1988) 171-182.
[15] Menaham (1988) 175.
[16] Menaham (1988) 176-177. In regard to the Orphic allusions he notes that F. M. Cross 'is one of those who deny the existence of such motifs here' n 15, 177.

Psalm 151 continues the biblical tradition of David as the shepherd/king. As noted, the general scholarly consensus recognizes I Sam 15-18 to be the main biblical background for Psalm 151. Smith has identified fourteen items that Psalm 151 shares with I Sam 15-18, with other items coming from I Sam 8, 10, 13; II Sam 6, 7; Ben Sira 47 and the Psalms (e.g., 45:2, 78:71, 89:21). Using a simpler division of the LXX version, Psalm 151 highlights the shepherd/sheep metaphor in the Davidic tradition in a two-fold midrash[17] as follows:

I. **Vs. 1-4** = David the shepherd, a midrash on I Sam 16:1-13. These verses emphasize David's humility and unlikely choice, along with his faithfulness and devotion to shepherd his father's sheep. This indicates why God was pleased with him and rewards him in verses 5-7. By extension, the community, in its own humility and obscurity, can trust that God will also reward them as David continues to be their example.

II. **Vs. 5-7** = David the King, a midrash on I Samuel 17:17-54. The anointing by Samuel and the Goliath story give witness and credibility to his kingship and to his authority to be the shepherd of Israel. His victory over Goliath is really the victory of God through David.

11QPs[a] 151 is a poetic expression of themes from I Samuel 16:1-13 in which the young shepherd, David, relates how he was chosen and anointed to be the ruler of his people. The Superscriptions are also suitably re-edited.[18] The box of material shown on the following page helps to clarify the difference in content between the LXX, Psalm 151 and 11QPs[a] 151.

---

[17] Smith (1997) 199-200.

[18] The Hebrew title is 'Hallelujah. Of David son of Jesse' for 151A and 'The beginning of David's power after God's prophet had anointed him' for 151B. The Septuagint has, 'This Psalm is a genuine one of David, though supernumerary, composed when he fought in single combat with Goliath'. The Syriac has either 'Of David. When he alone fought with Goliath'; or simply 'Thanksgiving of David'.

Psalm 151 NRSV	**LXX**	**11QPs[a] Smith's translation**[19]
This psalm is ascribed to David as his own composition, (though it is outside the number), after he had fought in single combat with Goliath.	οὗτος ὁ ψαλμὸς ἰδιόγραφος εἰς Δαυιδ καὶ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ ὅτε ἐμονομάχησεν τῷ Γολιαδ	A Halleluyah Of David, son of Jesse
1 I was small among my brothers, and the youngest in my father's house: I tended my father's sheep.	μικρὸς ἤμην ἐν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου καὶ νεώτερος ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ πατρός μου ἐποίμαινον τὰ πρόβατα τοῦ πατρός μου	[1] I was the least of my brothers, And smallest of my father's sons. And he made me shepherd to his sheep, And ruler over his goats
2 My hands made a harp, my fingers fashioned a lyre.	αἱ χεῖρές μου ἐποίησαν ὄργανον οἱ δάκτυλοί μου ἥρμοσαν ψαλτήριον	[2] And my hands made a pipe, And my fingers a lyre. And I gave honour to Yahweh, I truly said to myself: 'The mountains do not witness to Him, Nor do the hills tell of Him, Nor the trees, my words, Nor the sheep, my compositions'.
3 And who will tell my Lord? The Lord himself; it is he who hears.	καὶ τίς ἀναγγελεῖ τῷ κυρίῳ μου αὐτὸς κύριος αὐτὸς εἰσακούει	[3] For who can tell and who can express and who can relate the deeds of the Lord of All? The God of All has seen. He has heard and he has listened.
4 It was he who sent his messenger, and took me from my father's sheep, and anointed me with his anointing oil.	αὐτὸς ἐξαπέστειλεν τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἦρέν με ἐκ τῶν προβάτων τοῦ πατρός μου καὶ ἔχρισέν με ἐν τῷ ἐλαίῳ τῆς χρίσεως αὐτοῦ	[4] He sent His prophet to anoint me, Samuel to raise me.
5 My brothers were handsome and tall; but the Lord was not pleased with them.	οἱ ἀδελφοί μου καλοὶ καὶ μεγάλοι καὶ οὐκ εὐδόκησεν ἐν αὐτοῖς κύριος	[5]My brothers came out to meet him, Handsome of form and handsome of appearance. (Though) tall in their height, Handsome in their hair, The Lord God Chose them not. And he sent for and took me from after the sheep, And he anointed me with the holy oil. And he made me leader for His people And ruler over all the sons of His covenant.
6 I went out to meet the Philistine; and he cursed me by his idols.	ξῆλθον εἰς συνάντησιν τῷ ἀλλοφύλῳ καὶ ἐπικατηράσατό με ἐν τοῖς εἰδώλοις αὐτοῦ	
7 But I drew his own sword; I beheaded him, and took away disgrace from the people of Israel.	γὼ δὲ σπασάμενος τὴν παρ' αὐτοῦ μάχαιραν ἀπεκεφάλισα αὐτὸν καὶ ἦρα ὄνειδος ἐξ υἱῶν Ισραηλ	

[19] Smith (1997) 187-189.

Smith observes 'ten expressions [that] do not occur in the Greek and Syriac versions, but only in the expanded Hebrew version, rightly emphasized by Haran'.[20] From these expressions he identifies 'four strategies for completing lines'.[21] These observations are very helpful in understanding the material at the center of the poem above: lines 6-8. These lines are identified as the 'Orphic' lines (v 2). In these verses, trees and flocks of sheep are said to have enjoyed David's music, a possible adoption and adaptation of the Orpheus myth.[22]

Whatever one makes of these additional lines and whether they are "Orphic" or not, this view has met with strong criticism and is being questioned.[23] The observations and approach of M.S. Smith above are helpful in identifying which sources of the writer influence the OT. The beginning and the end of the poem have been strongly influenced by I Sam, while the center section of the poem shows no comparable borrowings.[24] M. S. Smith summarizes his observations this way:

In summary, Psalm 151 idealizes David as the shepherd/leader. He is 'chosen' by *YHWH* not because of his stature but because he trusts God. Here David's youth is remembered and I Samuel is the external 'plot' informing the internal 'passion' he has for God reflected in the psalm. These external and internal dimensions together communicate to the reader/hearer of the poem that God will take care of his people if they trust him. David is portrayed as the ideal Israelite and the ideal shepherd/leader of

---

[20] Smith (1997) 197, and Haran (1988) 176.
[21] Smith (1997) 197, 'First, the author-redactor extends usage from material in the older version of the poem...Second, the poet used traditional biblical wordings...Third, the poet used non-biblical and current religious language...Fourth, the poet ventured new parallel expressions to match material borrowed from 1 Samuel'.
[22] Cf. Sanders (1965) 61-63. Cf. further Sanders (1967), pp. 98-100; Rabinowitz (1964) 193-200; Smith (1980) 247-253; Cross (1978) 69-71.
[23] Smith (1997)198. Those who are still inclined toward an Orphic background for the verses Cf. Sanders (1967) 53-64, 98. Charlesworth and Sanders (1985) 2:609-616. For criticism, Rabinowitz (1964); Cross, (1978) 71; Smith (1997) Skehan (1976) 143-58.
[24] Smith (1997) 197.

Israel. The royal Davidic tradition is not overtly expressed in the psalm as is often the case when David is remembered.

> Moreover, David is a model for the community; in the words of I. Rabinowitz: 'This psalm is a homily with David as *exemplum*: David, though an insignificant stripling, glorified the Lord, and so came himself to glory; we, too, then humble though we may be, may expect future glory if now we honour God'.[25]

6.1.4 I Enoch 89:10-90:42[26]

The context for *The Book of the Dream Visions,* chapters 83-90 of *I Enoch,* comes from the time of the Maccabaean revolt of 169-164. Chapters 85-90, called *The Animal Apocalypse* (hereafter, *An. Apoc.*) are generally dated from ca. 165 to 160.[27] For these chapters, we will look generally at the context and content of the apocalypse, with special reference to the author's use of the metaphors 'the Lord of the sheep' and 'the seventy shepherds'.

During this post-exilic period, the kings/shepherds had not proven to be the valued leaders that the people had hoped for. The controversy over kingship generally had been in the tradition from the beginning.[28] After the exile, the monarchy diminished and the religious leadership of priest and scribe emerged. Priests began to replace kings and scribe replaced prophet.[29] It is in this setting that we review *I Enoch.*

---

[25] Smith (1997) 199-200.
[26] The English translation throughout is that of E. Isaac, in Charlesworth (1983) 63-72.
[27] This date is accepted by most commentators. Since the death of Judas in the spring of 160 B.C.E. is not mentioned, it is thought that the original form was written before this time. E.g. Tiller (1993) 78, 'The original *An. Apoc.* would then have been written some time before the battle of Beth-zur (spring 164 B.C.E.) and after Judas's initial victories over Apollonius and Seron (166 BCE)'. Nickelsburg (2001) 361, dates it 'between 165-163 B.C.E.'.
[28] Cf. the conflicting traditions in I Sam 8-12.
[29] Cohen (1987) 23-24 notes the importance of this shift from king to priest and from prophet to scribe.

I Enoch is a composite book and the following schematic is helpful, for our purposes, to put the *An. Apoc.* in the context of the book and the Second Temple period.[30]

The Book of the Watchers, 1-36	c. third century
The Book of the Similitudes, 37-71	c. 105-64 B.C.
The Book of the Astronomical Writings, 72-82	c. 110 B.C.
The Book of Dream Visions, 83-90	c. 165-161 B.C.
The Book of the Epistle of Enoch, 91-107	c. 105-104 B.C.

The author of the *An. Apoc.* uses an apocalyptic allegorical approach that traces human history from Adam to the eschaton. There are three different periods within the structure of the allegory: 1) From Adam to the flood, 85:1-89:9, 2) From Noah to the eschaton, 89:10-90:36 and 3) The New Age of the White Bull, 90:37-42. The author depicts human beings as animals and angels as human beings, a veritable 'zoomorphic history'[31] of humanity. The patriarchs through Isaac are portrayed as bulls. Jacob and his descendants are pictured as sheep and are continually victimized by different wild beasts of prey and scavengers that represent hostile forces against the 'Lord of the sheep' (89:16).[32] As punishment for the sheep's waywardness, sin and rebellion, the Lord of the sheep commits his flock to seventy shepherds (89:59), who are to rule for four periods.[33] Patrick Tiller understands these four periods and the number of shepherds as follows:

b. The sheep under the shepherds
   - i. The Babylonian period (12 shepherds)
   - ii. The Persian period (23 shepherds)
   - iii The Ptolemaic period (23 shepherds)
   - iv The Seleucid period (12 shepherds)

---

[30] For our purposes the general dates given in this schematic are followed. Cf. the thorough considerations of Tiller (1993) 61ff. Isaac (1983) 1:6-7 and Nickelsburg (2001) 360-361and 391-393. These general dates do not take into account the different fragments which may be in a section; e.g. chs. 6-11 in the *Book of the Watchers*, which is used by the author of the *An. Apoc.*

[31] Schurer (1986) 255.

[32] The first ref. to 'Lord of the sheep' is 89:16.

[33] The first ref. to the 'seventy shepherds' is 89:59.

c. The eschatological period of the restored sheep[34]

The seventy shepherds abuse their responsibility by allowing more of the sheep to be destroyed than was permitted by the Lord of the sheep. Authority is given to the seventy to rule but accountability of these seventy is to be exercised by another group of shepherds (angels?) who are to 'write down every destruction that each and every shepherd causes' (89:62). 'Each and every one of them [the seventy shepherds] kills and destroys in excess of their order' (89:69). Therefore the 'seventy shepherds were judged and found guilty; and they were cast into that fiery abyss' (90:25-26).

The final eschaton is depicted in a section of the tradition (90:9-19) that has engendered much debate. But in its current form, the great horned ram (90:9-19) probably represents Judas Maccabeus,[35] who wages war against the nations. The Lord of the sheep brings about the final judgment of the rebel watchers, the angelic shepherds, and the apostate Jews of the End time (90:20-27). Then a New Jerusalem and Temple are 'transformed...greater and loftier than the first one' (90:28-29). The section continues: 'Also I noticed that the house was large, wide, and exceedingly full' (90:36).

Finally, in the final division of the *An. Apoc.*, a snow-white cow/bull is born, this the new Adam and Messiah. As a result of the Messiah's coming the sheep and other animals are transformed into white cows/bulls, thus bringing about the eschatological unity of the whole of humanity that has now returned to its original purity.

We have discovered, in considering the characteristics and/or qualities of 'the Lord of the sheep' that these characteristics are consistent with the functional

---

[34] Tiller (1993) 55. For the background context of this discussion, this schematic will be followed.
[35] Tiller (1993) 62-79, 355ff; for textual/redactional issues in 90:9-19.

metaphor of the shepherd in the OT. The biblical background for *An. Apoc.*, while debated in detail, is certainly passages such as Jeremiah 23 & 25, Ezekiel 34, Zechariah 11, and certain Psalms which speak of God as Shepherd of Israel.[36] But the writer of the *An. Apoc.* may have had a more nuanced and complex approach in the way he has adopted the shepherd/sheep metaphor. There may be the actual desire to avoid directly or overtly using the term 'shepherd' in a positive way. *YHWH* is not the shepherd of his people, but throughout the allegory, he is 'the Lord of the sheep'. We might understand this as simply an alternative literary device if the term 'shepherd' were actually ever used, but the consistent use of 'Lord of the sheep' and absence of the term 'shepherd' in regard to God suggests there is an intentional avoidance of the use of the term 'shepherd'.

Jeremias has illustrated how God fulfills the role of shepherd but also observes that *YHWH* is not called shepherd at any point in the *An. Apoc.* He does not mention any possible significance to the fact that the shepherd term is not used. Yet, he argues that the function of a shepherd is evident.

> Though shepherds were despised in everyday life, nevertheless even in later Judaism, on the basis of the statements of the OT, God was described as the Shepherd of Israel who led His flock out of Egypt (Eth. En. 89:22, 24, 28), guides them in present, will one day gather again the scattered flock, and will feed them on the holy mountain. Moreover the leaders and teachers of Israel are also called shepherds; in particular Moses and David are extolled as faithful shepherds. In the vision of the shepherds in Eth. En. 85-90, however, the term is restricted to 70 Gentile rulers (or the angel princes of the peoples) which have dominion over Israel up to the establishment of the Messianic kingdom, Eth. En. 89:59; 90:22.[37]

My issue with Jeremias here is that he makes it sound like 'God was described as the Shepherd of Israel who led His flock out of Egypt' and then quotes the *An. Apoc.* 'Lord of the sheep' is descriptive but it is not the same as identifying God as the shepherd of

[36] Tiller (1993) 58-59; Nickelsburg (2001) 391; for biblical sources regarding 'Negligent Shepherds'.

Israel which the author of *An. Apoc.* never does. I think he does not do this because the metaphor is a negative one in light of the evil kings of Israel that led to exile and the crises of leadership and contested leadership as well. In the *An. Apoc.* it is not a royal Davidic shepherd who is either anticipated or who is presented as coming in Jeremiah 23:4-6 or in Ezekiel 34:23-24 and 37:24-25. In contrast are the wicked seventy who do not rule in righteousness but abuse the flock and are judged and banished. The shepherd motif in the hands of the writer of the *An. Apoc.* is a negative image and is seemingly beyond redeeming even in regard to *YHWH.*

The function of a 'shepherd' image may be in the background in regard to the allegory through the use of 'Lord of the sheep' but I think there is a stronger anti-shepherd motif being put forward by the author. Again, except for the 'Lord of the sheep', the only shepherds in the allegory have become abusive and malevolent.

When the 'Lord of the sheep' phrase is analyzed from its first appearance in 89:16 through chapter 90 (28 times), a number of different characteristics can be identified that are consistent with the function of the shepherd metaphor in the biblical tradition. God is regularly identified as *'egzi'a abage*, in Ethiopic, is literally 'the owner, master, lord of the sheep'.[38] The term *'egzi'*, like *kurios,* carries the different nuances of meaning as well.[39] Tiller consistently translates the phrase in his commentary as 'the owner of the sheep,' but both Nicklesburg and Isaac use 'the Lord of the sheep'.[40] When the phrase is considered text by text the following seven characteristics of the 'Lord of the sheep' can be identified: 1) He initiates with mercy and compassion and 'visits' them, is 'with' them and ultimately delivers the sheep from distress/captivity (89:16; 89:22;

---

[37] Jeremias *TDNT* 489.
[38] Tiller (1993) 280.
[39] Tiller (1993) 280-281.
[40] Cf. Tiller (1993) 278-287; Nickelsburg (2001) 365; Isaac (1983) 1:65.

89:52; 90:38).[41] 2) He inspires awe and fear by his majesty and is marvelous to behold (89:22-23; 89:26; 89:30). 3) He provides pasture and sustenance (89:28). 4) He provides human leadership (89:29; 89:37 Moses; in 89:42, 45 Judas Maccabeaus; Cf. 89:45; 90:14, 20-21). 5) He provides a place and his presence is in that place (89:50 twice; 90:29). 6) He protects and warns sheep (89:25, 51). 7) He holds everyone to account (89:33; 89:54; 89:75-76). a) first the rebellious sheep b) then the seventy shepherds (89:71-72; 90:15-70).

The review of these texts illustrate beyond doubt that the 'Lord of the sheep' has the qualities and functions as a shepherd throughout. Yet, and this is my point, the writer refuses to use the term 'shepherd' in an extended allegory concerning sheep and rams and lambs and goats. I propose the reason is that he reserves the shepherd image for one purpose, to emphasize his *anti-shepherd* theme which will be developed in relation to the seventy shepherds. He is deeply distressed over the evil leadership that has subjected the people of God to such abuse.

In focusing on the seventy shepherds, I will first make a few observations concerning their role and the writer's use of them in regard to defending God's justice. Israel deserves punishment because she has broken covenant and so God has 'handed those sheep over' (89:60) to the seventy shepherds for punishment. However, God applies restrictions and limits to the seventy (cf. Job). These restrictions are established by God and then 'another' is summoned to monitor them: 'Observe and see everything that the shepherds do against these sheep' (89:61). According to the author's understanding, Israel suffers intensely because the seventy shepherds go beyond the limits set by God. Israel has sinned and God punishes Israel, but the amount of suffering

[41] In 90:38 a snow-white cow was born (Messiah) and transforms all the cows and animals in the allegory and 'The Lord of the sheep rejoiced over it and over all the cows'.

is beyond what God desires. Something else is at work. Someone else is to blame. The seventy shepherds themselves, appointed by God, have over-stepped their bounds. This is typical in the *anti-shepherd* tradition. Those appointed by God go beyond God-given authority, abusing divine authority and, in turn, abusing the sheep. The prophetic condemnation of the negligent, abusive, and disobedient shepherds of Israel is the backdrop to this tradition (e.g. Jer 23, 25; Ez 34; Is 56:9-11). It is this prophetic condemnation that the author of I Enoch uses to develop the *anti-shepherd* tradition in his own time and circumstances.

Consistent with the allegorical genre of the author, the seventy 'shepherds' are angelic beings of some sort, something other than 'human'.[42] The author emphasizes two points about the seventy: 1) their function as leaders of the sheep and 2) the biblical traditions that speak of the anti-shepherds from Ezekiel 34 and Zechariah 11.[43]

When the twenty-five references to the seventy-shepherds are analyzed a brief summary of the following characteristics may be identified: 1) God gives the sheep to the oversight and pasture of the seventy;[44] 2) The seventy are divided into groups and are given different time periods to shepherd the flock;[45] 3) The seventy have limited authority to destroy and slaughter some of the sheep;[46] 4) God anticipates they will abuse this authority 'of their own accord';[47] 5) They will abandon the sheep to wild

---

[42] Nickelsburg (2001) 390. 'That the seventy shepherds are angels has been disputed, mainly because they are described in terms that the Bible attributes to human leaders called "shepherds."...Their heavenly nature seems certain, however'.
[43] Nickelsburg (2001) 391.
[44] 89:59; God 'surrendered those sheep to them that they might pasture them'.
[45] 89:64, 72; 90:5.
[46] 89:60-62.
[47] 89:62 (2 times) 'excess and destruction' is anticipated and the 'destruction' will be by 'shepherd causes'.

animals;[48] and 6) The seventy shepherds will be held to account for how they shepherd.[49]

The seventy shepherds are always meant to be understood in a negative light. The author of the *An. Apoc.* can be understood to emphasize in the allegory that the shepherd metaphor is a negative image because of the history of the abuse and negligence of the leaders.

Thus, the proposal of this thesis is that the author of I Enoch emphasizes only the negative tradition of the anti-shepherd rather than the more traditional prophetic approach that contrasts both good and bad shepherds. In other words, I Enoch, especially the *An. Apoc.* characterizes the leadership of Israel as having no good shepherds.

Earlier, the question concerning the identification of the 'other' in 89:61 was introduced. In an attempt to understand who this 'other' is, Isaac makes an interpretive judgment in his translation at this point. He translates this '*another*' with the editorial comment as follows:

> He [the Lord] then summoned seventy shepherds and surrendered[50] those sheep to them so that they might pasture them. He spoke to the shepherds and their colleagues, 'From now on, let each and every one of you graze the sheep; and do everything which I command you. I shall hand them over to you duly counted and tell you which among them are to be destroyed; and you shall destroy them!' So he handed over those sheep to them. Then calling *another (group of shepherds)*, he told them, 'Take notice and see everything which the shepherds will do to those sheep, for they will destroy from among them a greater number than those which I have commanded them'.

This editorial comment by Isaac to define the 'other/another' as a group of shepherds, who 'take notice' of the other shepherds, might indicate this is a good group of shepherds and the shepherd metaphor is then used in a positive way. On the other

---

[48] 89:66 and 'they abandoned those sheep' 90:4.
[49] 89:60-62; 90:22, 25.
[50] Lit. 'cast off, threw away'. Tiller (1993) 325. 'One might expect that the owner would entrust the sheep to the shepherds to tend them. The owner's action regarding the sheep is even more emphatically negative than his abandoning them in 89:55-56'.

hand, both Tiller and Nickelsburg argue that the 'other' is an individual, a 'heavenly scribe'.[51] Tiller says, 'Surely he is not another shepherd. Apparently the allegory has faded and what is meant is another angel'.[52] Tiller emphasizes that the heavenly scribe is a kind of 'angelic auditor, to observe, correct, and record discrepancies' of the seventy shepherds.[53]

In my judgment, the editorial comment of Isaac is less persuasive than Tiller and Nickelsburg. This 'other' is probably best understood, not as another shepherd (or group of shepherds), but as an angelic scribe with the task of writing down the specific actions of the seventy shepherds, including their abuses. This commission is not without analogy in regard to other angelic scribes. Earlier in I Enoch 9, Michael, Sariel, Raphael, and Gabriel have similar roles. There is also a parallel in Ezekiel 9 where the angelic scribe is commissioned to record the events surrounding the events of the slaughter of those in Jerusalem. My conclusion is that this 'other' is not a shepherd, but the angelic scribe/writer who oversees all the activities of the seventy shepherds.

In contrast to the anti-shepherd motif, the writer of the *An. Apoc.* uses the sheep/lamb/ram metaphor in positive ways. In the *An. Apoc.* it is not a shepherd or shepherds, but three sheep who bring renewal by 'returning, arriving, entering, and beginning to build all (the parts) of that house which had fallen down' (89:72). The three sheep are identified as Zerubabel, Joshua, and Nehemiah.[54]

---

[51] Nickelsburg (2001) 390.
[52] Tiller (1993) 326.
[53] Tiller (1993) 326. For the function of this 'other', cf. 89:70-71, 76-77; 90:14, 17, 22. According to 90:22 this heavenly auditor is also one of the seven holy ones who are witnesses for God.
[54] Begg (1988) 152-156. He reviews the history of the discussion very well and opts for these three. Cf. Tiller (1993) 337-340 who agrees as well, if the proper reading is 'three' and not 'two', there is a textual variant, but the majority reading is three'.

While the sheep/lambs/rams are all the same species, and so there is an equality of kind, distinctions are made concerning strength, power and differences of role and importance. On the other hand, the author communicates that shepherds often think of themselves as unique, even exercising God-given authority beyond its divine intention. Hence, the shepherding metaphor is again used in a negative way. The shepherds of Israel have failed God and his 'lambs' (90:9) and the author no longer can appropriate the shepherd metaphor in light of this disillusionment. The writer, seemingly, does not want Judas Maccabeus, who is his hero (savior?) to be understood or seen as being a shepherd of Israel.[55] It would seem this might be because of the negligence and abuse of the shepherds of Israel. Even Judas Maccabeus, as noted earlier, is not a new faithful shepherd, but a 'great horned ram'. Further, the Messiah is not depicted as a shepherd but as a 'white bull'. It would almost seem that never in an allegory about sheep is the positive use of the term 'shepherd' so carefully avoided.

During this post-exilic period, there was an anti-shepherd attitude, which had continued from the prophets of the exile. The anti-shepherd image was introduced in the biblical tradition due to problems with kings, false prophets and religious leadership who were abusive, evil-shepherds in contrast to the true shepherds of Israel.[56] The emphasis concerning this anti-shepherd metaphor in the prophets of the exile and beyond is also related to the reluctance after the exile to return to a strong form of monarchy. Ironically, this will happen to a degree with Hasmonean dynasty. One wonders what the writer of the *An. Apoc.* might have thought as he saw the developments of the coming years. We now turn to the Qumran materials to see the shepherd metaphor is much more hopeful.

---

[55] Judas is probably ref. to again in 90:9, 'a great horn sprouted on one of those sheep'. Nickelsburg (2001) 400; Tiller (1993) 354 and 62-63.

6.1.5 Qumran: Selected Texts

The use of the shepherd/sheep terminology in the Qumran community is somewhat infrequent in light of the overall amount of material. There are numerous references to the literal usage indicating the awareness of the shepherd vocation among the Patriarchs and Israel's early history.[57] In the *'Words of the Luminaries'* (4Q504 *Frags.* 1 – 2 *col.* IV) reference is made to the covenant established with David who 'like a shepherd, is a 'prince' over Israel.[58] This royal Davidic tradition that had been relatively dormant in early Judaism[59] now resurfaces in Qumran. It may have been a result of contested leadership because of the rise of a non-Davidic kingship in the Hasmonean period. This may well have been part of what sets the stage for Davidic messianic hopes to re-emerge. The crisis in Israel during this period caused Qumran, and others,[60] to reject both the priesthood in Jerusalem and the Hasmonean dynasty. The promises of old were recovered from Isaiah 11:1-9, Jeremiah 23:5-6, Ezekiel 34:23-24, 36:24-25, and other messianic texts were drawn upon resulting with the referral of the 'Branch of David' several times at Qumran to describe an anointed eschatological king.[61] The community condemned the Jerusalem leadership's interpretation of the Pentateuchal laws of purity. Along with the *Temple Scroll,* many of the *pesharim* condemn or criticize the priests of Jerusalem (e.g. *1Q14* 11.1; *1QpHab* 9:9-10; 11:4-7; 12:2-6). Not only did they contest the current leadership, but they also understood that one day 'the branch of

---

[56] E.g. Num 27:17 and parallels: Jer 23, 25:30-38; Ez 34; Is 56:9-12.
[57] E.g. 1QapGn 21.5-6; 1QapGn 22.1-2, Martinez and Tigchelaar (1997) 45-47. Cf. 11Q19 LII 7-21, Martinez and Tigchelaar (1997) 1273.
[58] 'And you chose the tribe of *6* Judah, and established your covenant with David so that he would be *7* like a shepherd, a prince over your people,...'. 4Q504 *Frags.* 1 – 2 *col.* IV (Puech *col.* XV) in Martinez & Tigchelaar (1997) 2;1015.
[59] Collins (1995) 31-34. He contends, 'In all, then, we have very little evidence of messianism in Judaism in the period 500-200 BCE,...We have much fuller documentation for the period 200-150 BCE'. 33.
[60] E.g. The writer of the *Psalms of Solomon,* writes in response to the Roman occupation and interprets Pompey's defeat of the Hasmoneans as God's judgment upon them. But Roman is no better so the longed for hope of a Davidic Messiah.

David', according to the pesher on II Samuel 7:12-14, would emerge with the 'Interpreter of the Law who [will rise up] in Zi[on in] the last days' and bring a legitimate kingship and interpretation of the law (*Florilegium, 4Q174* 1-3.10-12; cf. *Rule of the Community (1Q28a* 2:11-17).[62]

This royal tradition at Qumran referred to the Messiah as 'prince'.[63] The shepherd image is associated with the prince. So, once again the shepherd metaphor is connected with royal David tradition. Other selected uses that illustrate this are from the *Damascus Document:* CD13:7-10; 19:6-11; 4Q266, fragments 11 and 4; *Commentary on Ps. 37:* 4Q171, III 5^{a}-8; and from *1QFestival Prayers:* 1Q34 + 1Q34bis (1QlitPr).

Probably the most celebrated text is from the *Damascus Document,* CD 13:7-13, of which Jeremias could say, 'This comparison of the leader of the community with the shepherd is the closest analogy to the similar statements in the NT'.[64] In the *Damascus Document* the leader of the community (called *mevaqqer,* the 'Examiner,' 'Overseer/Guardian') will gather all the scattered sheep as a shepherd. The broader context, 13:7-21, describes the character and role of this leader in the community. This section occurs with a group of texts that begin with the phrase, 'This is the Rule for...' the community.[65] *CD* 13:7-21 is grouped with these texts. The metaphor of shepherd is used along with the image of the compassionate father to clarify the attitude of the *mevaqqer* and the way the *mevagger* is to function. 'The Rule for the Examiner' (CD13:7-21) identifies the obligations and authority of this Overseer/Guardian to: 1) instruct the congregation in the ways/works of God, 2) determine who may enter the congregation and assign him his rank within the Community, 3) monitor the

---

[61] E.g. 4Q161; 4Q174; 4Q252; 4Q285.
[62] Murphy-O'Connor *EDSS* 1:402-404.
[63] Cf. Collins (1995) 60-63; Evans (2000) 1:540-541.
[64] J. Jeremias *TDNT* 6:489.

commercial activities and relations of the members, 4) approve the marriage and divorce of members, and 5) teach their sons and daughters.[66] Along with these tasks the text also describes the "spirit" in which the Guardian is to exercise his authority.

> *9* He shall have pity on them like a father on his sons, and will heal all the <afflicted among them> *like a shepherd his flock. 10* He will undo all the chains which bind them, so that there will be neither *harassed nor oppressed* in his congregation.[67]

What is clear is that the Examiner is to lead with the compassion of a father and bring the care and healing of a shepherd to the community. The qualities of the Overseer/Guardian are drawn from the best elements of the biblical tradition. The compassion/pity is described like that of 'a father on his sons'. The leader 'examines' and 'guards' as a shepherd examines and protects the sheep. Under the guidance and care of this one, like a shepherd, the community will be healed. So the language, while positive and hopeful for the Qumran members, may point to their opposition to the shepherd/leaders of their time. This may well have been part of the appeal of the community. It held out the offer of a 'counter-culture' alternative to the religious status quo and the abuses, whether real or perceived, of the religious leaders in Jerusalem.[68]

The relationship of the *CD* to the *Rule of the Community* has been debated;[69] *CD* is essentially a document clarifying the historical vision and purpose of a community with the understanding that it was the true Israel, those chosen by God as his unique remnant. They understood themselves as the true alternative to the apostate Judaism lodged in Jerusalem. They understood themselves to be 'a deviant separatist movement'

---

[65] Alexander (*EDSS*) 2:799-803. '*Serekh,* the word for "rule" in the Dead Sea Scrolls, like *yahad* ("community") is probably part of the distinctive religious vocabulary of the Dead Sea sect'.
[66] Alexander (*EDSS*) 2:801.
[67] Martinez and Tigchelaar (1997) 1:573; CD A XIII-XIV Col (4Q266 9 III; 4Q267 9 IV, V).
[68] Stanton (1992) 85-107.
[69] Vermes, (1999) 42-43.

in opposition to the dominant Jewish culture.[70] The appeal of the community was to offer a 'more genuine' alternative and this was to be modeled by the *mevaqqer*.[71] Leadership described as 'like a shepherd' is both positive and challenging to the current leadership in Jerusalem.

Another relevant text is the quotation of Zechariah 13:7 in CD 19:6-11, which is also a text quoted in Matthew 26:31. In Matthew, Jesus is identified as the shepherd of this text, but in this quotation in *CD* 19:6-11[72] the 'shepherd' that is struck is not identified specifically (thus the italic):

> when God visits the earth, *7* when there comes the word which is written by the hand of the prophet Zechariah: *Zech 13:7* <<Wake up, sword, against *8 my shepherd*, and against the male who is my companion – oracle of God – strike *the shepherd*, and the flock may scatter, *9* and I shall turn my hand against the little ones>>. Those who revere him are *Zech 11:11* <<the poor ones of the flock>>. *10* These shall escape in the age of the visitation; but those that remain shall be delivered up to the sword when there comes the Messiah *11* of Aaron and Israel.[73]

The shepherd of Zechariah's prophecy, 'my companion' that is being struck by God would seem to be the king.[74] When this shepherd-king is struck, the sheep will be scattered. This is consistent with the tradition because when the sheep have no shepherd they will be 'scattered on the mountains' (I Kings 22:17). The Lord's judgment not only comes upon the shepherd and the members of the flock who 'despise the precepts and the ordinances' (non-members of the community; leaders in Jerusalem), but also on the 'little ones' (the members of the community). Those who will be delivered will be the humble, those 'who revere' the Lord. There are also

---

[70] Stanton (1992) 90.
[71] Knibb *EDSS* 1:137.
[72] Martinez and Tigchelaar (1997) 1:577.
[73] Baumgarten (1999)1:169; Cf. Evans *EDSS* 1:537-542.
[74] Wright (1996) 587; Bruce (1968) 100-114.

examples from the biblical tradition that show the community understood itself to be 'the people of your redemption and the sheep of your pasture'.[75]

In the tradition of Jeremiah 23:5 and Ezekiel 34:23-34 (36:24-25) the community hoped for 'one shepherd' in *4Q266, fragment 4 (Parallels: CD XX 33-34):*

11. God [will set up one shep]herd who will feed them in [the pasture
12. and will be [ ] and will choose unto himself [
13. mercy [[76]

Vermes notes that the lines 11-12 were badly preserved in fragment 4 of *4Q266,* but considered them to be an allusion to the Messiah. He suggests the following translation: 'God [will set up] a shep[herd for His people] and he will feed [them] in [pasture]...'[77]

In summary, the community at Qumran, in the context of contested leadership in Jerusalem, recovered the biblical tradition of the royal Davidic tradition in order to establish hope for their community. This royal tradition was referred to, among other titles, by the 'Branch of David' and 'prince,' who are at times associated with the shepherd metaphor. They understood the shepherd/leadership in Jerusalem to not be legitimate and as a result were oppressive through their opposition to the community. The shepherd/sheep metaphor continued to provide a way of self-understanding in times of crises and contested leadership; they were the sheep of God's 'redemption'. Also, through the prophetic tradition, they challenged the unfaithful or evil leadership of their day.[78] Thus, they present themselves as an alternative community to the evil establishment in Jerusalem.

---

[75] Baumgarten (1996) 76-78; *4Q266,fragment 11 (Parallels:4Q270,fr.7i-ii).*
[76] Baumgarten (1996) 46-47. Line 11 'was restored by Milik on the basis of Ez 34:23; cf. Ez 34:14; Ps 78:72.' This fragment was omitted by Martinez & Tigchelaar.
[77] Vermes (1998) 136 n 9.
[78] Evans *EDSS* 1:540-541.

6.1.6 Psalms of Solomon 17:21-46[79]

The *Psalms of Solomon* is generally dated in the middle of the first century B.C.E. The internal evidence points to a time of crisis when the psalmist is deeply distressed about the state of the nation in light of a foreign conqueror. Charlesworth writes, 'Identification of the conqueror with Antiochus Epiphanes, Herod the Great, Pompey, and Titus shows each had its supporters. But the allusions best match Pompey...who took Jerusalem in 63 B.C.'[80] The promised king, the son of David, is described at 17:21. The text explicitly connects the Davidic Messiah and the shepherd metaphor in 17:40-42:

> *faithfully and righteously shepherding* the Lord's flock, he will not let any of them stumble in their pasture. He will lead them in holiness and there will be no arrogance among them, that any should be oppressed. This is the beauty of the king of Israel which God knew, to raise him over the house of Israel to discipline it.

These Psalms reflect the struggle and distress of the psalmist concerning the conflict between the Jews being ruled by a foreign conqueror, probably Rome, and the belief that Israel was God's chosen people. This situation of pagan rule has been caused, according to the writer, by the sin of the people (1:7-8; 2:11-13; 8:9-14, 22; 17:5-8; 19-20). But, he argues, God has not abandoned Israel; he is simply exercising his divine discipline and will one day have mercy again (7:3-10; 9:9-11). This hope is expressed in the prophecy of the Davidic Messiah, who like David will be God's shepherd for his people. The psalmist looks forward to the day when the Messiah, the son of David, will come and rid the nations of its enemies and restore Jerusalem to its proper place (17:21-25, 45). Yet, this Messiah is not primarily depicted as a military

---

[79] Cf. The introductions in Isaac (1983) 2:639-650, and Trafton (1992).
[80] Charlesworth (1983) 2:640-641.

figure, because his reliance will be in God, not in horse or rider or bow (17:33-34).[81] The writer describes the Messiah in a number of ways including: king (17:21, 32, 42), judge (17:26-29), shepherd (17:40-41) and Lord Messiah (17:32). In *Ps. Sol.* 17:32 the psalmist says, 'their king shall be the Lord Messiah.' The translation of this phrase has often been amended to read 'the Lord's Messiah.'[82] Wright argues that, 'The term is preserved here with the MS evidence as a current messianic title combining the concepts of lordship and anointed agent.'[83] In light of this evidence it is understandable why these explicit and detailed messianic expectations have influenced the understanding of much pre-Christian Jewish messianic hope and have been important to NT eschatology and to Jesus' own use of these images in regard to his ministry. This is one of the clearest references in this time period to the combination of the Davidic Messiah and the shepherd metaphor.

6.2 Philo

Philo is a contemporary of Jesus, possibly born around 20 B.C.E.[84] He was from a wealthy Jewish family and able to devote his full attention to exploring the Hebrew Scriptures in the tradition of Jewish Alexandrian exegesis. He was comfortable with both worlds of Greek and Jewish culture; there was no hint of struggle within him to reconcile the two worlds.[85] Yet, it was as a Jewish philosopher and exegete that 'Philo counts himself "in the school of Moses"'(*Mut.* 223).[86]

---

[81] Traditional texts informing these prophecies might be e.g. Psalm 2 and Isaiah 11.
[82] Charlesworth (1983-85) 2:667-668 R. B. Wright argues for retaining 'the Lord Messiah' in footnote 'z' rather than changing it to 'the Lord's Messiah'. He argues it is 'A title for the expected apocalyptic king'. This translation is also followed by VanderKam (2000) 220.
[83] Cf. N. T. Wright (1996) 533-534; After quoting *Ps. Sol.* 17:21, 39-42 says, "Jesus' use of 'shepherd' imagery, therefore, is comprehensible within this Jewish setting as an evocation of messianic roles and expectation, even while the style he adopted set him apart from other would-be Messiah-figures of the period".
[84] Barclay (1996) 159.

6.2.1 Introduction

Philo loves the Pentateuch and he often uses the stories of the patriarchs in order to apply his allegorical method of exegesis in his use of the shepherd metaphor. For him, shepherding is part of the sacred story of the patriarchs and carries full dignity and respect. So in *De agricultura* 1:41 he says,

> the occupation of a shepherd (ποιμαίνειν) has come to be considered a respectable and profitable employment, so that the race of poets has been accustomed to call kings the shepherds of the people (ποιμένας λαῶν); but the law giver gives this title to the wise, who are the only real kings, for he represents them as rulers of all men of irrational passions, as of a flock of sheep.

For Philo the positive merits of shepherding do not arise so much from the vocation itself (cf. *Agr.* 61), but from how the νοῦς (mind) shepherds the soul, and controls its irrational powers. This theme is discussed at different points throughout Philo, but in one extended passage he develops the theme extensively, where 'All the nuances of Philonic usage are to be found in the connected passage *Agr.* 26-66'.[87]

6.2.2 *De agricultura* 1:26-66.

In this passage Philo begins by identifying two types of herders. '[B]y resorting to allegory' he finds there is a difference between 'shepherd' (ποιμένα) and 'keeper of sheep' (κτηνοτρόφον). He understands that many see these as the same. However, those who understand that reason (λογισμός) is the superintendent of the flock of the soul and the person who is an indifferent manager is a 'keeper of sheep,' will see that the good and faithful one is the 'shepherd'. He then contrasts the mind with the irrational powers of the soul (*Agr.* 30). Those who live unrestrained lives are like scattered sheep but reason collects the flock like a shepherd (*Agr.* 30-39). He

---

[85] Barclay (1996) 161.
[86] Barclay (1996) 163.
[87] Jeremias *TDNT* 6:490.

describes these irrational distractions in some detail and then turns to describe the shepherds who supply first the necessities of life, but do not indulge the senses. In addition, the shepherd (mind, νοῦς) guards the flock against disease and prevents the flock from scattering (39-41). Next, Philo draws on Numbers 27:17 and says of Moses, the all-wise (πανσόφῳ):[88]

> [he] prays that the flock may not be left without a shepherd, meaning by the flock the whole multitude of the parts of the soul; but that they may meet with a good shepherd, who will lead them away from the nets of folly, and injustice, and all wickedness, and conduct them to the doctrines of learning and all other virtue;... he adds, 'And the assembly of the Lord shall not be like sheep who have no shepherd'.[89]

Consistent with the Greco-Roman tradition, for Philo, Moses is 'shepherd of the people' like Agamemnon.

At this point, Philo shifts his discussion of the shepherd to society. The wise shepherd does not allow anarchy to rule. But he warns against the other extreme as well, a wise shepherd is not weak or as he says, 'men who are too good and gentle' (46-47). These two kinds of 'herders' are simply 'keepers of herds' (κτηνοτρόφων)[90] and not really true shepherds at all. He continues to use pastoral language even to describe the negative traits of the undisciplined. He proceeds to describe that the mind should govern all conduct (48):

> that our mind should govern all our conduct, like a goatherd (αἰπόλον), or a cowherd (βουκόλον), or a shepherd (ποιμένα), or, in short, like any herdsman (κοινῶς νομέα) of any kind.

In light of these descriptions Philo explains the good shepherd (ἀγαθοῦ ποιμένος). For the good shepherd the 'mind ought to rule' (ἄρχειν νοῦν). Because the good shepherd prefers what is 'advantagous,' rather than what is 'agreeable' or pleasant (48).

---

[88] *Agr. 43.*
[89] *Agr. 44.*
[90] κτηνο-τρόφος, ον, (τρέφω) keeping cattle, pastoral

How does one attain to this? Philo argues that this only happens by the care and oversight of God, who is the genuine shepherd as provider, guide and overseer. Basing his argument on Psalm 23, that God himself is this kind of shepherd, Philo continues to praise the role.

> Thus, indeed, being a shepherd is a good thing, so that it is justly attributed, not only to kings, and to wise men, and to souls who are perfectly purified, but also to God, the ruler of all things; ...for he speaks thus, "The Lord is my shepherd, and he shall cause me to lack nothing;"... For God, like a shepherd and a king, governs (as if they were a flock of sheep) the earth,....[91]

The justification for the praise of the shepherd, in contrast to the later rabbis, is God who is the shepherd. The biblical tradition conditions his praise of the shepherd metaphor.

Even Philo's use of God's 'logos and first-born son' appointed to be the shepherd makes its way into the passage:

> appointing, as their immediate superintendent, his own right reason, his first-born son (λόγον καὶ πρωτόγονον υἱόν), who is to receive the charge of this sacred company, as the lieutenant of the great king; for it is said somewhere, "Behold, I am he! I will send my messenger before thy face, who shall keep thee in the road" (Ex 23:20).

God, according to Philo, by means of the 'logos,' represents himself in the world and provides so that nothing should be lacking. These texts are representative of Philo's use of the shepherd motif. He uses it allegorically in regard to the mind (διανοίας) which is the shepherd of the body and able to control its conduct (49).

Yet for all his praise of the shepherd metaphor, according to Philo the actual shepherd status was very low:

> 'such occupations are accounted inglorious and mean (ἄδοξα γὰρ καὶ ταπεινὰ; of no account) among those who are loaded with great prosperity, without being at the same time endowed with prudence, and especially among kings'.[92]

---

[91] *Agr. 50-51.*
[92] *Agr. 61.*

This is a typical way in which the shepherd occupation is often presented in antiquity. There is a tension between the work of a shepherd depicted as inglorious and the use of the shepherd metaphor to describe kings. This tension continues in Philo. It continues to be one of the unresolved tensions in the extant materials.

In summary, we have tried to appreciate Philo's unique gifts and contributions. Philo has his own unique way of treating the biblical tradition. He esteems the image because it is a biblical metaphor and the heroes of his faith were shepherds (Abraham, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, *Agr.* 42-43). He relates it to his philosophy of the Hebrew Scriptures. As a philosophical and an allegorical principle, it serves him well. The virtues of his Jewish faith are supported and the vices of paganism may be identified and shunned. God himself is associated with the image and therefore, in light of his understanding of reason (λόγος) (51) God as a shepherd puts life in order. So, in light of *De agricutura,* Philo has a very positive view of the shepherd metaphor in spite of the reality of the social status of real shepherds.

6.3 Some Rabbinic References

In this final section, I will consider how the shepherd vocation was viewed. Also considered will be whether the attitude toward the shepherd vocation influenced the way the metaphor was understood. These two questions are very difficult to answer with any kind of certainty. The 'stereotypical' understanding of these two issues, based upon two clear references, was to describe the shepherd occupation as a 'despised trade'. Therefore it was seen negatively by all in the first century. The two references, one from the *Mishnah* the other from the *Babylonian Talmud* have led to this conclusion. The problem with these two references is that they are much later than the first century. The *Mishnah* is not written down until ca. 200 C.E. and the *Babylonian Talmud* is 'finally completed

around the middle of the sixth century'.[93] It is commonly recognized that concerns about the dating of material in the *Mishnah* and the later Jewish materials is a real issue in using these texts to tell us anything about the first century C.E. Therefore trying to understand the status of the shepherd/sheep metaphor in the first century is also difficult. But having acknowledged the historical problems it may still be beneficial to explore this issue further. To clarify what the rabbis understood by the 'despised trades' it will be helpful to list them here.

6.3.1 Shepherd as a 'despised trade'

The 'despised trades' can be noted in lists of occupations in the *Mishnah* and the *Talmuds.* Ranked among those despised trades is the herdsman/shepherd.[94]

The lists are as follows:

m Qidd. 4:14	*b. Sanh.* 25b
1. Ass-driver	1. Gambler with Dice
2. Camel-driver	2. Usurer
3. Sailor	3. Pigeon-trainer
4. Carter [pottery merchant]	4. Dealer in produce of sabbatical year
5. Herdsman [shepherd]	5. Herdsman [shepherd]
6. Shopkeeper	6. Tax collector
7. Physician	7. Publican[95]
8. Butcher	

Along with these lists, there is the comment in the *Midrash* on Psalm 23:2, 'R. Jose bar Hanina taught: In the whole work you find no occupation more despised than that of the shepherd, all his days he walks about with his staff and his pouch'.[96] This kind of material has been used to foster the image in the first century that the shepherd was despised and a disenfranchised member of society. However, one of the dilemmas, as noted above, has to do with the late date of such sources. Typically,

[93] Strack & Stemberger (1991) 194.
[94] Jeremias (1969) 303-312.
[95] Jeremias (1969) 304.

rabbinic materials are dated according to the names of rabbis attributed with the saying or tradition. Stemberger thinks that the Tannaitic attributions are generally reliable.[97] If that approach is taken then Abba Saul who quotes the first list in the *Mishnah* is dated about 150 and the R Jose bar Hannina is from the third century. It is outside of the scope of the thesis to pursue these second and third century issues but they are noted in addition to the pejorative quote by Philo above.[98] There is definitely a negative attitude toward the shepherd vocation. Among the rabbis one of the reasons stated is that shepherds cannot be trusted because they steal, to one degree or another, from the owners of the sheep or use grazing land and water that does not belong to them. That having been said, the cautions of Horsley are also worth considering.[99] The literary statements made about shepherds are mostly made by the elite of society. Though they saw the occupation as 'inglorious and of no account', it may be because shepherds were economically on the margins of society. We will consider this from another perspective in the next section.

6.3.2 Shepherds as ordinary peasants

To further pursue the negative attitude toward the shepherd vocation, we will ask the questions a bit differently. Granted shepherds were among the lowly of the society, they were peasants after all, but the question is 'How lowly?' and "According to whom?' Who perceived them that way? Everyone? Or only the more elite parts of the society? There may be differing perceptions according to who was speaking about

---

[96] Braude (1959) 1:327.

[97] Strack & Stemberger (1991) 57-58. Stemberger claims to discern five generations of Tannaim and seven of Amoraim. He dates only the second generation (c. 90-130 C.E.) and the third generation (c. 130-160 C.E.) of Tannaites. Similarly, Danby (1933) 799-800 lists six generations of the Tanniam: c.10 to 240 CE. Sanders (1977) 60 accepts the Tannaitic literature as an accurate account of rabbinic materials from 70-200 C.E. *Pace* Neusner (1994) 651-658, who is pessimistic about any dating and has given up dating anything other than the final written document.

[98] *Agr. 61.*

[99] Horsley (1995) 102-103.

the shepherd. Is it appropriate to say Philo is an intellectual Jewish elitist? He is among the wealthy by any standards of the ancient world. Do the Rabbis have other more religious concerns? Generally, most of the references to shepherds we have come from the more elite stratification of the society. Does that affect the way we now view them? The fact that shepherds were of a low status among the more powerful of society may (but may not) indicate their low status in the rest of society in the first century. There is little direct evidence concerning how the common peasant associated with and perceived the shepherd of the day. It may be that they were simply 'ordinary' peasants among other peasants and not in some way singled out any more than any other occupation and trade may be singled out for its abuses. Could both of these perspectives be held together, by simply acknowledging the witness of the texts (even though they are sometimes late) and that shepherds were ordinary people? It may well be that Horsley is right to this extent that in Luke 2 the shepherds are 'the obvious local representatives' of the ordinary people.[100]

The reality that shepherds had, or could have had, a suspicious reputation is warranted. The laws concerning herding point in this direction. Due to the nature of the occupation there were opportunities for them to 'cheat' and 'rob' the owner of the sheep through their use of the wool and milk or even engage in inaccurate reporting of the annual offspring. This is indicated in the laws and regulations related to shepherds. This is confirmed by the later rabbinic materials. But their status may not have been any lower than other peasant groups in the first century.

[100] Horsley (1995) 104.

6.3.3 Shepherd as a 'would be' Messiah

In a passage from the *Ant.* and the *J.W.*, Josephus refers to a specific occurrence that may illustrate that it was possible for the common people to be willing to acknowledge leadership in a shepherd, even though they were a lowly part of society. He reports one individual who set himself up as king during the time of Herod the Great and received a following for 'a great while':

> Athronges, a person neither eminent by the dignity of his progenitors, nor for any great wealth he was possessed of, but one that had in all respects been a shepherd only, and was not known by anyone; yet because he was a tall man, and excelled others in the strength of his hands, he was so bold as to set up himself for king.[101]

According to Josephus he had four brothers and, 'Each of these ruled over a band of men of their own; for those who got together to them were very numerous.[102] This passage may well illustrate that while the elite in society may have 'despised' the shepherd, the 'ordinary' people may have seen them as common people who could gather a following.

In summary, the social status of the shepherd in the first century was low and probably did not have a good reputation as the later documents attest and the few contemporary witnesses would seem to confirm. But their status as ordinary peasants may not have been any lowlier than other peasant groups. They may well have made 'the lists' of later generations for reasons having to do with the moral 'hazards' of the job as much as any reason. Technically, to be a shepherd of sheep and goats was not a violation of the Jewish law, even though the occupation would later become suspect and be considered outside the Law.

---

[101] Josephus tells the story twice: *Ant. 17:278-281* and *J.W. 2:60-62.*
[102] *Ant. 17:279*

6.4 Summary

There are two observations from the material considered in this chapter. When the shepherd metaphor is considered in light of the biblical tradition there are two streams of tradition. First, there is a positive evaluation of the shepherd metaphor when characterized by the patriarchs, Moses, David and the Davidic Messiah. Qumran would emphasize the 'branch of David' and 'the prince' as well as positive uses of the shepherd metaphor. The Psalms of Solomon would use the shepherd image as an image of hope in the face of the Roman occupation of Israel in 63 B.C.E.

Second, there is the anti-shepherd motif in the prophetic tradition of Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Zechariah. Second Temple Judaism would also know this tradition. During times of national crises and contested leadership the shepherd image may have been avoided as in the case of I Enoch because 'shepherds' as leaders of whatever kind were mostly evil. What Matthew will do with these two streams within the tradition will be to bring the two together and present them as in tension with each other illustrating Jesus as Shepherd-Messiah and Herod and the Jewish leadership of his day as the anti-shepherds. In the final chapter of this study we now turn our attention to a close look at Jesus as shepherd in the Gospel of Matthew.

CHAPTER 7
JESUS AS SHEPHERD IN MATTHEW

7.1 Introduction

In preparation for looking closely at Matthew's use of the shepherd metaphor, I have attempted to give the background to his use of the metaphor. Thus, we have reviewed the biblical tradition, selected texts from the ANE, the OT and Second Temple Judaism. In this final chapter we will analyze Matthew's use of the shepherd metaphor. Matthew uses ποιμήν, the noun for shepherd,[1] three times in his Gospel and the verb ποιμαίνω once.[2] Matthew only uses these terms metaphorically, never literally. Through these four uses Matthew establishes Jesus as the messianic shepherd. This chapter will show how Matthew accomplishes this. These four Matthean texts will be examined: 2:6; 9:36; 25:31-32; 26:31 along with Matthew 15:24.

The procedure for examining each of these five Matthean texts will involve a textual analysis, an intertextual analysis, a contextual analysis and a metaphor analysis. It is important to note that the first two texts (Mt 2:6 and 9:35-10:1) will receive longer and more thorough treatment than the other three texts. The reason for this is that I will introduce and explore major Matthean themes relevant to the shepherd metaphor, Matthean literary techniques and special linguistic characteristics in the first two that then need not be repeated in the remaining three.

7.2 Mt. 2:6—Introduction and Structure of Mt 2:1-11

The first shepherd text for consideration is Matthew 2:6. The context of 2:1-11 is the Matthean infancy narrative of chapters 1 and 2. It has often been pointed out that

---

[1] ποιμήν, ένος, ὁ *shepherd*—fig. Mt 9:36 // Mk 6:34; Mt 25:32; Mt 26:31 // Mk 14:27.

[2] ποιμαίνω *herd, tend, (lead to) pasture*—fig.—a. in the sense 'lead,' 'guide,' 'rule' Mt 2:6; J 21:16; Ac 20:28; 1 Pt 5:2; Rv 2; 27; 12:5; 19:15.—b. *care for, look after* Jd 12; Rv 7:17.

many of the theological themes and motifs of Matthew's Gospel generally are introduced in these opening two chapters.[3] These theological motifs are introduced by Matthew's explicit scriptural comment by way of the formula quotations, also by explicit narrative description and implicit narrative devices.[4]

Matthew 1:1 introduces Jesus as 'Messiah (Χριστός), the son of David, the son of Abraham,' and with these descriptions Matthew immediately introduces the reader to his christological focus.[5] The identification of Jesus as Messiah (1:1, 16) is supported later in the chapter when he is called Emmanuel, God with us (1:23) and the significance of his name given because he will save his people from their sins (1:21).

---

[3] Stanton (1992) 360, 'Nearly all the evangelist's distinctive themes are found in chapters 1 and 2: the infancy narratives form a theological prologue to the Gospel as a whole.' Luz 1:162 also notes the way Mt introduces important theological themes in these chapters as well: 'The formula quotations are notably frequent in the prologue, because here the evangelist introduces those viewpoints and accents which are important for the whole Gospel and which the reader must keep in mind while perusing the entire Gospel. The formula quotations which are scattered in the rest of the Gospel are then reminders'.

[4] Stanton (2002) 64-67. Senior (1997) 94... 'in these opening chapters the main themes of Jesus' mission are sounded and by means of the formula quotations the evangelist immediately asserts that all of Jesus' mission is a fulfillment of the Old Testament.' A recent narrative approach to Matthean Christology is represented by Donaldson (2005) 100-122. Some of these narrative themes will be pointed out in the discussion below and an exhaustive list is not necessary here but just to clarify what is meant concerning Matthew's explicit and implicit narrative approach. 1) Explicit Narrative Description: *Christology*—Christ/Messiah (1:1, 16, 18; 2:4; 16:16, 20; 22:42; 24:5, 23; 26:63, 68) Son of David/King (1:1; 1:20; 2:2; 9:27; 12:23; 15:22; 20:30-31; 21:9, 15; 27:37) Son of God (1:21-23; 2:15; 3:17; 4:3, 6; 8:29; 11:27; 16:16; 17:5; 21:4-5; 26:63; 27:54; 28:19) *Fulfillment*—the formula quotations (1:22-23; 2:15; 2:17-18; 2:23; 4:14-16; 8:17; 12:17-21; 13:35; 21:4-5; 27:9-10). Specific phrases that occur at crucial points in the narrative: e.g. *'God with us.'* (1:23; 18:20; 28:20). 2) Implicit Narrative Devices: The evangelist often uses the device of comparison (e.g. Jesus is compared to Moses) and/or contrast (e.g. 'King' Herod and 'King' Jesus). He uses many allusions from the biblical tradition, beyond the use of the quotation, in his development of the numerous christological themes. So, the explicit use of Son of Abraham in 1:1implies that Jesus is the true Israelite (e.g. chapter 2) and by Jesus 'the nations will be blessed' through his birth, baptism, temptations, ministry, death and resurrection. The Gentiles are meant to participate in this promise (28:18-20). Differing motifs and theological themes, e.g. *Righteousness/Discipleship*—Joseph in the infancy narrative is a true disciple who is described as righteous (1:19), and he obeys throughout the narrative in his actions with Mary (1:18-25), in fleeing to Egypt (2:13-15), in returning (2:19-23). The theme of righteous/righteousness runs through the Gospel (1:19; 3:15; 5:6, 10, 20, 45; 6:1, 33; 21:32; 25:37, 46). *Acceptance/Rejection motif*—Herod's response versus that of the Magi to Jesus: 2:11—worship/homage, προσκυνέω (Mt 2:2, 8, 11, 13-23). The theme will continue through the Gospel, e.g. 8:2; 9:18; 14:33; 20:20; 15:25; 28:9, 17. Matthew used these kinds of literary techniques, and others, to communicate the Gospel story.

[5] Davis and Allison 1:159-160...the phrase 'Son of David' represents Jesus as the king of Israel, the rightful heir to the Davidic promises. This too pertains to eschatology: the Messiah has come. Lastly, 'Son of Abraham' probably implied not only that Jesus is a true Israelite but also...that with his appearance God's promise to the patriarch has been realized: all the nations of the earth (cf. 28.19) have been blessed'.

'In Matthew 2 the emphasis shifts from the identity of Jesus to a series of places. If the major concern of chapter 1 was "Who?" the major concern of chapter 2 is "Where?"'[6] The question 'where?' (ποῦ, 2:2, 4) is implicitly asked three times and Scripture is used in each case to answer the question: where was the King of the Jews born? Bethlehem of Judea (2:5-6); where did the Messiah go after his birth? Egypt and back again to Israel (2:13-15); and where did the Messiah finally live? He lived in Nazareth of Galilee (2:19-23). 'Where' is also emphasized by the place names in chapter two: Bethlehem and Jerusalem (v 1, 3, 8), Egypt, Ramah and Nazareth (2:13-23). Along with Matthew's concern for the questions of 'who' and 'where' of Jesus, there are character contrasts, reactions and responses throughout the narrative. Through these narrative devices, the reader encounters the character of Jesus according to Matthew. Therefore, whether by description or by the events of the narrative, the primary concern of the evangelist is christological. Jesus is the one born king of the Jews (2:2) and is portrayed as the ruler who will shepherd God's people (2:6).

Matthew 2 has frequently been divided into five sections structured around the biblical quotations.[7] The challenge to this division is that the biblical allusions in 2:11[8] are not as explicit as the quotations in 2:6, 15, 18 and 23, and 2:11 has no place name. Also, the general consensus is that any division of the chapter that does not recognize

---

[6] Stendahl (1983) 57-58, 'Matt. 2 is dominated by geographical names. This is the more striking in contrast to chap. 1, which has not a single one [note 10: 'Except for the phrase "the deportation to Babylon" in 1:11, 12, 17, where it serves as a temporal designation.'] not even where we would expect them, i.e. in 1:18f... Cf. Brown (1988) 178-183; Harrington (1991) 46.

[7] E.g. Hengel and Merkel (1973); Fenton (1964). The four place names are associated with four of the five quotations: 1) vv 1-6: v 6 (Mic 5:1, 3) Bethlehem. 2) vv 7-12: v 11 (Ps 72:10-11; Is 60:6) No place name. 3) vv 13-15: v 15 (Hos 11:1) Egypt. 4) vv 16-18: v 18 (Jer 31:15) Rama. 5) vv 19-23: v 23 (Is 11:1?) Nazareth.

[8] Ps 72:10-11and possibly v 15 and Is 60:6.

the major break between 2:1-12 and 2:13-23 is considered questionable.[9] Yet, the scriptural quotations are crucial to the chapter and 'have as their foundation christological convictions—they are, indeed, christocentric'.[10] Christology is paramount; the focus is on the contrasts of the responses to the child by the magi, the people of Jerusalem, 'the chief priests and scribes of the people,' and by Herod. The chapter is unified by the two contrasting stories of 2:1-12 and 2:13-23. The first is a story of acceptance, the other one of rejection.[11]

Mt 2:1-12 has been summarized and analyzed in a number of ways. Luz and Hagner propose a structure that is much simpler. After the introductory question of magi (vv 1-2), Luz identifies two parts: (1) the encounter with Herod, the false king of the Jews (vv 2-9a) and (2) the encounter with the child of Bethlehem, the true king (vv 9b-12). The two parts correspond to the narrative's central conflict between the strategy of Herod and the strategy of God.[12] Hagner suggests an "a-b-a" structure: (a) the magi's arrival and message (vv 1-2), (b) Herod's troubled reaction (vv 3-8), and (a) the magi's worship of the child (vv 9-12).[13]

These are in contrast to the more detailed analysis of Davies and Allison, who envision 2:1-12 as the second of three acts (act one, 1:18-25; act three, 2:13-23) in the 'infancy drama' and divide it into six short scenes: [14]

> A. The magi come to Judea, to look for the king of the Jews. (2:1-2). B. Herod learns from the priests and scribes where the Messiah is to be born. (2:3-6).
> C. Herod asks for the magi's cooperation (2:7-8).
> D. The magi follow a star to Bethlehem. (2:9-10).
> E. The magi pay homage to the child. (2:11).
> F. The magi, being warned in a dream not to return to Herod, leave Bethlehem. (2:12).

---

[9] Davies and Allison 1:224. Cf. Brown (1988) 178-179; Hagner 1:24; Luz 1:129.
[10] Hagner 1:lvi.
[11] Luz 1:129. 'Without 2:1-12, the section 2:13-23 would not be understandable'.
[12] Luz 1:129.
[13] Hagner 1:24.
[14] Davies and Allison 1:224, who seem to follow Lohmeyer (1967) 19.

Matthew's use of the biblical traditions in this passage is different than in the formula quotations of chapters 1 and 2. The compound quote in Mt 2:6 from Mic 5:1-2 and II Sam 5:2 is an integral part of the narrative.[15] There are other possible related biblical allusions in Matthew 2:9 (cf. Num 23:7 LXX, 'out of the east';[16] Num 24:17-19 LXX)[17] and Mt 2:11 (cf. Ps 72:10-11, 15; Is 60: 1-6).[18] The narrative is filled with comparisons and contrasts as we can see in the following chiastic pattern:[19]

A 2:1-2 The magi search for the newborn King of the Jews
  B 2:3-4 Herod the King and the ruling religious leaders inquire about the Christ
    C 2:5-6 The religious leaders tell King Herod the Shepherd King will rule
  BB` 2:7-8 Herod the King responds to the King of the Jews
AA` 2:9-12 The magi respond to the King of the Jews

This structure highlights one of the main themes in the section, the 'acceptance/rejection' motif.[20] It also recognizes the integral functioning of the OT quote in the narrative. In this way, Matthew's OT quote differs from the other formula quotes of the infancy narrative. The response of the religious leaders in 2:5 and biblical quotation in 2:6 are central to the narrative and are important in the overall story. It is part of the irony of the narrative that the quotation comes from the religious

---

[15] It is often noted that the 'formula quotations' of Matthew are not an integral part of the narrative; that is, if they are removed, the narrative flow is not effected. That is not the case of the quotation in 2:6; it is integral to the narrative of 2:1-12. I would propose that 2:6 is not a formula quotation but one of the other 21 independent quotations peculiar to Matthew.

[16] Gundry (1994) 27, 'Like the Gentile prophet Balaam they have come "from the east" (cf....Philo's calling Balaam a magus in *Mos.1.50.276*)'.

[17] Gundry (1994) 27, 'The star...derives from the royal star seen to rise by Balaam (Num 24:17-19 LXX) and interpreted messianically in late Judaism (...cf. Bar Cochba, "son of a star", acclaimed as the Messiah by some Jews during the Second Jewish War of A.D. 132-135)'.

[18] Gundry (1994) 27, 'It would be a mistake to think that because Matthew fails to quote Num 23:7; 24:17-19 explicitly he has little or no interest in them. Throughout his Gospel he subtly conforms phraseology to the OT. Since Jesus has already been introduced as David's son, Matthew expects his readers to catch such allusions; or he takes private delight in them'.

[19] The contrasting and comparing main characters and events was an ancient rhetorical strategy σύγκρισις, 'comparison.' Stanton (1993) 77-84. This literary device will be used below to appreciate Matthew's narrative approach of contrasting and comparing characters and events. Cf. Luz 1:129, 'But not only the kings Herod and Jesus but also the Magi and Herod are contrasted with each other: The narrator Matthew quite deliberately parallels the two direct discourses in vv. 2 and 8: Both begin with the question about the new king and end with the desire to worship him (προσκυνέω)'.

[20] Stanton (2002) 65-66, 'These twin themes [acceptance/rejection] are prominent in the infancy narrative'.

leaders, who do not follow-up or search for the possible newborn king. The authority of the quote is its source in Scripture, not the religious leaders.[21] The outline gives a framework for the explicit and the implicit narrative comparisons and contrasts in the passage. A narrative tension is created between the one born 'king of the Jews' and King Herod's response and the positive response of the Gentile magi.

7.2.1 Textual Analysis of Mt 2:6

The shepherd text at Mt 2:6 is a compound or double quotation[22] combining Mic 5:1(2) and II Sam 5:2. There is no clear indication that Matthew is following the LXX or the MT in Mic 5:1(2).[23] On the other hand, II Sam 5:2 is very close to the LXX. Matthew's use of texts cannot be reduced to a simplified formula. Some texts apparently are his own redaction, some are from the LXX, and some from something close to the MT. The sources of the texts must be understood in light of the fluidity of first-century circumstances, rather than the relatively fixed understanding of the biblical tradition today.

Matthew uses his sources with authority to accomplish his purposes. As noted above, when following Mark or Q Matthew traditionally follows the LXX, but when using his own sources he seems willing to 'mix' the text according to his own intentions and theological concerns. The position in this thesis concerning Matthew's

---

[21] Davies and Allison 3:577, 'The assumption of the formula quotations is the authority of the Jewish Bible: The Scriptures measure truth.'.... This is of course true for all of Matthew's uses of the OT, both quotes and allusions.

[22] The language at this point can be confusing. I will use 'compound quotation', the phrase used by Brown (1988) 175, or 'double quotation' when referring to more than one scripture text in any given citation and 'mixed quotation' when referring to the combination of LXX and MT textual traditions in a citation. So, e.g. Luz 1:130 calls 2:6 a 'mixed quotation' when referring to the combination of the two citations.

[23] Stanton (1992) 260. Stanton is of the conviction that Matthew does not use a standard text of the LXX or the MT when quoting texts that are unique to him; in other words Matthew seems freer to redact his own sources than those traditions he has received, for example, from Mark or Q. 'Given the evangelist's penchant for the text form used by his sources, the fluidity of textual traditions in the first century, and the possibility that some passages have been quoted from memory or adapted to fit the context, perhaps this [the Mt 2:6 quote] is not surprising'.

use of the OT is in the tradition of Gundry, Rothfuchs, McConnell, Soares Prabhu, Brown, Stanton, and Davies and Allison.

Matthew's intent is to use the biblical traditions in such a way as to give a particular shape and emphasis to his Christology and ecclesiology. For Matthew, Jesus is the Messiah and Son of David, and, according to the biblical tradition, he is the shepherd of God's people. Matthew presents Jesus as the righteous and royal shepherd. Jesus is righteous because he comes from God, according to the prophecy of Mic 5:1-3. He is royal because he is born of the royal lineage and comes from the house of David following II Sam 5:2.

Matthew uses Micah and II Samuel to clarify the identity of Jesus of Nazareth and to announce how he fulfills biblical tradition in his own day. Through the combination of the two texts, Mic 5:1 and II Sam 5:2, he intends to identify the child as both in the line of David and the Jewish Messiah.[24]

Line 1)[25] Mt 2:6, καὶ σὺ Βηθλέεμ, γῆ Ἰούδα,
LXX Mic 5:2, καὶ σύ Βηθλεεμ οἶκος τοῦ Εφραθα
MT Mic 5:2, וְאַתָּה בֵּית־לֶחֶם אֶפְרָתָה

Matthew 2:6 is a mixed quotation (LXX and MT) which is confirmed by the change from 'house of Ephrathah' in the LXX and 'Ephrathah' in the MT with his own: γῆ Ἰούδα, 'land of Judah'. The language is typically Matthean and is expressed in his use of the vocative, γῆ Ἰούδα (O land of Judah) rather than the expected genitive, γῆς Ἰούδα (O land of Judah). The use of the vocative (γῆ) is more awkward, but it is a favorite of the redactor (Mt: 43 times; Mk:19 times and Lk: 25 times). In chapter 2, Matthew always refers to 'the land' (2:6, 20, 21), again

[24] Cf. Brown (1988) 184-187. Davies and Allison 1:242, 'The differences are in fact sufficient to tempt one to speak of an "interpretation" instead of a "quotation" of Scripture'. Cf. Lust (1997) 65-88.
[25] Brown (1988) 185.

emphasizing the territorial aspect of Matthew 2. The references to Judah (twice in vs. 6) are probably meant to connect Jesus with the patriarch Judah (Mt 1:2-3) in the mind of the reader.[26] This is relevant because Messiah was to come from the tribe of Judah. So, the royal tradition of King David and the Davidic lineage are recalled from chapter one concerning the 'newborn king of the Jews'. The reference to Judah in vs. 6 connects with the earlier references in 2:1, 5 in the immediate context and anticipates 2:22. So, lineage and land are used to establish Jesus' credibility as the newborn king of the Jews. Matthew also utilizes the long royal Davidic tradition in relation to the shepherd metaphor.

Matthew's use of the OT in the current passage demonstrates how he uses a compound text and illustrates how he does not strictly follow either the LXX or the MT.

Line 2)[27] Mt 2:6, οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἶ ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν Ἰούδα·
LXX Mic 5:2, ὀλιγοστὸς εἶ τοῦ εἶναι ἐν χιλιάσιν Ιουδα
MT Mic 5:2, צָעִיר לִהְיוֹת בְּאַלְפֵי יְהוּדָה

The first difference is οὐδαμῶς, '*by no means,*[28] which replaces the LXX, ὀλιγοστὸς, *one out of a few.*[29] This change is significant because the point in both the LXX and MT is that Bethlehem *is* small (ἐλαχίστη) among the thousands, but after Matthew's change, Bethlehem is, with emphasis, '*by no means least among the leaders of Judah'*. Hagner makes an interesting proposal in an attempt to understand the change, 'If in the MT the initial ל were read as the negative particle לא, (lō') that is with

---

[26] Davies and Allison 1:242,"'Ephrathah" (cf. Gen 35.19; 48.7) would likely have meant little to Matthew's audience. "Judah", by way of contrast, is full of meaning. It emphasizes the connexion [sic] between Jesus and the patriarch Judah (cf. 1.2-3)—so important because the Davidic Messiah was expected to come from the tribe of Judah....'
[27] Brown (1988) 185.
[28] BDAG: 'a marker of emphatic negation.' A NT *hapax legomenon*; only here in 2:6, rare in the LXX as well, only in 2, 3, 4 Maccabees.
[29] LSJ: '**ὀλῐγοστός,** ή, όν, (ὀλίγος) *one out of a few,* opp. to **πολλοστός,** ή, όν, (πολλός, πολύς) *one of many.*'

the slight change of לִהְיוֹת (liḥyôṯ) to לאֹהְיוֹת, (lōʾhyôṯ) a reading is produced that coincides with Matthew's Greek rendering of the passage'.[30] If Hagner is correct in his proposal, then the change may or may not have been introduced by the evangelist. Whatever the explanation, the change is significant because Matthew has made Bethlehem great because of its association with the Messiah. Yet, this is the very kind of change that Matthew has become known for in his dealing with OT. May it be that according to Matthew, 'because the Messiah has come into the world at Bethlehem, he has brought the city greatness'?[31] Does the reversal also contrast the place of apparent power and influence, Jerusalem, with the apparently small and insignificant Bethlehem as now having great importance because of God's choice and initiative?

Next, the LXX has χιλιάσιν, *'thousands'*, which Matthew changes to 'prince or ruler', ἡγεμόσιν.[32] Here also, an explanation for the change may be a result of the Hebrew. Most commentators think if the Hebrew consonants are pointed differently there is a potential understanding for the change. On the one hand, ʾalp̄ê, אַלְפֵי means 'thousands/clans',[33] but, on the other hand, the Hebrew consonants could be pointed ʾallûp̄ê, אַלּוּפֵי or אַלּוּף meaning 'chief/leaders/princes'.[34] Matthew, by all indications,

---

[30] Hagner 1:29, 'This reading, given its appropriateness in a reference to the birth of the coming ruler, could possibly already have been circulating in Matthew's time'.

[31] So Davies and Allison 1:242-243. They also note that in 5:19; 25:40 and 25:45 'other things qualified as "the least" become important'.

[32] BDAG: 'ἡγεμών, όνος, ὁ: 1. one who rules, esp. in a preeminent position, *ruler*.... ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν Ἰούδα *among the rulers of Judah* Mt 2:6 (after Mi 5:1; the rendering ἐν τ. ἡγεμόσιν instead of the LXX ἐν χιλιάσιν, following rabbinic methods of interpretation, is suggested by ἡγούμενον in 2 Sam 5:2, cited in the last part of Mt 2:6)'.

[33] Or אֶלֶף (ʾelep) 'thousand'.

[34] Or אַלּוּף (ʾallûp) 'chief.' This helps clarify what potentially lies behind the reading in Mt 2:6 where 'princes' of Judah reflects a pointing ʾallûp in the Hebrew of Mic 5:1.

has access to Hebrew textual traditions as well as the LXX and the MT; this may explain the change.[35]

Line 3)[36] Mt 2:6, ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ ἐξελεύσεται ἡγούμενος,
LXX Mic 5:2, ἐκ σοῦ μοι ἐξελεύσεται τοῦ εἶναι εἰς ἄρχοντα ἐν τῷ Ισραηλ
MT Mic 5:2, מִמְּךָ֤ לִי֙ יֵצֵ֣א לִֽהְיוֹת֙ מוֹשֵׁ֣ל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵ֔ל

Matthew introduces the conjunctive (γὰρ) 'for' because it helps clarify the preceding emphatic negation (οὐδαμῶς) 'by no means the least'. Matthew then uses the present middle participle, 'ruler' (ἡγούμενος), which replaces the LXX: ἄρχοντα.[37] Matthew chooses ἡγούμενος probably because of its similarity to ἡγεμών in line 2 above.[38] ἡγούμενος is sometimes used to refer to a Roman governor or one 'of princely authority'.[39] In the next line is Matthew's description of the nature or kind of 'rule' that will be exercised by Messiah. Matthew's single use of the verb, 'you shall shepherd, ποιμανεῖς,[40] my people Israel' gives this description. According to the Micah prophecy, the Messiah will come from the now significant hamlet of Bethlehem, the town of David, and he will be the rightful ruler of the people of Israel. Lest his rule be confused with any other, it is now confirmed that he will rule as a shepherd, as a shepherd shepherds his flock.

Line 4)[41] Mt 2:6, ὅστις ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ἰσραήλ.
LXX II Sam 5:2, σὺ ποιμανεῖς τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ισραηλ
MT II Sam 5:2//I Chron 11:2, אַתָּה֙ תִּרְעֶ֣ה אֶת־עַמִּ֔י אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵ֖ל וְאַתָּ֣ה תִֽהְיֶ֔ה לְנָגִ֖יד עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵֽל׃

---

[35] So Davies and Allison 1:242-43; Hagner 1:29; Luz 1:130 and others. Davies and Allison even propose that this change not only explains Matthew's reading, but that '[h]e is working with the Hebrew'. 243.
[36] Brown (1988) 186.
[37] Ps 68:27(LXX 28) ἐκεῖ Βενιαμιν νεώτερος ἐν ἐκστάσει ἄρχοντες Ιουδα ἡγεμόνες αὐτῶν ἄρχοντες Ζαβουλων ἄρχοντες Νεφθαλι. 'There is Benjamin, the least of them, in the lead, the princes of Judah in a body, the Zebulun, the princes of Naphtali.'.
[38] So Davies and Allison 1:242-43; Hagner 1:29; Luz 1:130 and others.
[39] BDAG: '**ἡγέομαι** fut. ἡγήσομαι LXX; *1. to be in a supervisory capacity, lead, guide*'.
[40] BDAG: '**ποιμαίνω**: *herd, tend, (lead to) pasture*'.
[41] Brown (1988) 186.

While it should be noted that line 4 in Mt 2:6 is similar to Mic 5:3 and it shares the language of the shepherd,[42] the general consensus is that line 4 is from II Sam 5:2. It might well have been the larger context of the Micah passage that brought to mind the shepherd metaphor, but it is significant that the II Samuel text was chosen. With its obvious connections to David, it causes the prophecy to bring to mind the promised dynasty of the house of David. Again, intertextually Matthew identifies the shepherd metaphor with the royal Davidic tradition. The final line shifts from Micah to II Sam 5:2//I Chron 11:2, hence the compound nature of the quotation. That it is II Sam 5:2 that is being quoted is confirmed by the close verbal parallel with the LXX and the MT. The primary difference is Matthew's introduction of the relative pronoun (ὅστις) '*who* will shepherd/rule' which replaces the personal pronoun (σὺ) '*you* will shepherd/rule.' So, Matthew surprises the reader again. Just when the expectation might be for a mixed text, he returns to the LXX and the MT. Matthew probably wants the reader to keep in mind the larger context of Micah 5, but by introducing II Sam 5 he emphasizes the Davidic Christology that has been a theme throughout the infancy narrative.[43] In this way the II Samuel quote repeats a Matthean theme that has already been introduced, λαός, the 'people' of Israel.

Matthew leaves little doubt about the status of this 'newborn king of the Jews'. The combination of Mic 5:2 with its Davidic characteristics and the passage from II Sam

---

[42] Mic 5:3a (LXX): καὶ στήσεται καὶ ὄψεται καὶ ποιμανεῖ τὸ ποίμνιον αὐτοῦ ἐν ἰσχύι κυρίου... 5:4, And he shall stand and feed his flock in the strength of the LORD,... Davies and Allison 1:244 ask, 'Why does the evangelist not go on to quote the rest of Mic 5:2? Mention of one "whose origin is from of old, from ancient days" would have admirably suited the purposes reflected by the genealogy; and 5:3 ("until the time when she who is in travail has brought forth") would have been to the point coming after 1:18-25. Maybe the readers are supposed to fill in for themselves.' Also Mic 5:4. Cf. Gundry's comment above that Matthew expects the reader/hearer to appreciate the OT allusions and larger OT background. Also cf. the position of C. H. Dodd and B. Lindars from a generation ago.

[43] Hagner 1:29, 'It was rabbinic practice to combine quotations referring to the same thing, particularly when linked by a key word or common concept, in the present instance "ruling" and "shepherding." The messianic king, the Son of David, would shepherd his people. The special appropriateness of a Davidic context for Matthew is obvious'.

5:2 (an OT promise that is addressed directly to David) affirm and anticipate Matthew's Son of David Christology.

> The application of the quotation, unlike the formula quotations of the first two chapters, is straightforward, involving no dimension of *sensus plenior* or deeper fulfillment. Its meaning is obvious: the Messiah (the verse was understood as messianic by the Jews) is to be born in Bethlehem, the very place where Jesus' birth had already occurred. The Messiah is to "shepherd my people Israel," which recalls the statement in 1:21 that "he will save his people." The people of the Lord are thus the people of the Messiah.[44]

What has been pointed out in the examination of Matthew's use of the OT in regard to the formula quotations has now been given fresh application in this non-formula quote in Mt 2:6. Matthew utilizes mixed textual traditions, with strong evidence that part of that tradition includes Hebrew traditions beyond the MT, along with his use of Greek and the LXX.

In summary, 1) Ephrathah becomes 'the land of Judah'; 2) 'princes' and 'ruler' replace 'thousands/clans' and 'ruler' 3) Bethlehem is no longer 'the least', but emphatically 'by no means the least' and 4) the promise made to David is now applied to the 'shepherd' who is from the lineage of David and who will 'shepherd my people Israel'.

7.2.2 Intertextual Analysis of Mt 2:6 and Mt 2:11

In light of the discussion concerning intertextuality in Chapter 3, the specific application here will be to (1) identify the nature of the quotation(s) in 2:6 and (2) identify the nature of the allusion(s) in 2:11. Next, any implications concerning the broader context from which the quotation(s) or allusion(s) come will be considered. Therefore, in relation to 2:6 the larger contexts of Mic 5 and II Sam 5 will be explored. Concerning 2:11, the whole of Psalm 72 will be examined and the broader context of Is 60 will be analyzed. Finally, in both cases the question of textual echoes will be

[44] Hagner 1:29-30.

examined, taking into account that the echo of a sub-text may or may not have been intended by the author. In most cases, questions of intention are left open, even if there are reasons to speculate.

7.2.2.1 Mt 2:6 and Mic 5:2(1); II Sam 5:2//I Chr 11:2

Mt 2:6 is a compound/composite quotation of Mic 5:2(1) and II Sam 5:2//I Chr 11:2.[45]

> Mic 5:2(1), καὶ σὺ Βηθλέεμ, γῆ Ἰούδα, οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἶ ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν Ἰούδα· ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ ἐξελεύσεται ἡγούμενος, II Sam 5:2, ὅστις ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ἰσραήλ.

It has been debated as to whether this quotation should be in the list of formula quotations.[46] There are three good reasons not to include 2:6 in the list and to understand it as one of the twenty-one unique, Matthean quotations.[47]

First, Mt 2:6 does not contain some variation of the characteristic formula, 'it was to fulfill' (πληρόω), which is one of the defining elements of the formula quotations.[48] Besides the ten formula quotations, the use of the verb πληρόω in regard to scripture fulfillment, only occurs four other times in Matthew: 3:15; 5:17; 26:54 and 26:56.[49] It is interesting to note that these references are from the lips of Jesus. Otherwise, the formula quotes are all Matthean commentary. If, Matthew took his lead

---

[45] Since I Chr is textually identical to the LXX of II Sam 5:2, the II Sam text will be the focus.
[46] It even appears that some scholars go back and forth as to whether to include it. E.g. Davies and Allison 1:191 do list it as one of 'the five so-called "formula quotations"' in the first two chapters of Matthew. But they exclude it from their list of 10 in (1997) 3:573-574. This only illustrates the difficulty of classifying the quote, Stanton (1993) 360. Luz seems to classify it as a *formula quotation* but acknowledges that it does not contain the typical πληρόω. (1988) 1:130; Soares Prabhu (1976) Preface, and more recently Menken (2004) 255 do not consider it a formula quotation.
[47] Cf. the chart of scriptural references in Davies and Allison 1:34-57. If Matthew 2:6 is ruled out as a formula quotation, none of the shepherd texts are among the 'formula quotations'.
[48] Davies and Allison 3:574 give the different variations on the redactional formula.
[49] Mark only uses it once as a fulfillment saying, 14:49; cf 1:15 for the other Markan use. Luke uses it 9 times, but only 3 times in a fulfillment context: 1:20; 4:21; 24:44. Acts 3 times: 1:16; 3:18; 13:27. John 8 times: 12:38; 13:18; 15:25; 17:12; 18:9, 32; 19:24, 36. The only other occurrence, when used in a fulfillment sense in the NT seems to be Jam 2:23.

from Jesus in Mark 14:49 (cf. the Matthean redaction of Mt 26:56 and the πληρόω texts), he has developed the fulfillment theme about as much as one could have hoped.

Another argument against 2:6 being a formula quote is that in the narrative it is offered by the Jewish leaders rather than by Matthew. Again, the formula quotations are characteristically Matthean commentary with the exception of the four quotes mentioned above. This does not affect the importance of the quotation in the narrative because the quote is an integral part of the story. But if it is to be considered a formula quote, then 2:6 is inconsistent with this pattern of functioning as a commentary on the text rather than as an integral part of the story.[50] The consensus is, with 1:22-23 being the possible exception, all ten formula quotes are offered by Matthew only. This means that the formula quotations offer Matthew's unique perspective on Jesus as seen in light of Israel's scripture.

Third, Mt 2:6, as an integral part of the narrative, is basic to the plot. Mt 2:6 is the answer to the question concerning 'where' does the Messiah come from. Again, the formula quotes can be lifted from the narrative and the story line is not affected. In contrast, Mt 2:6 is given in direct response to the two questions, the first by the Magi, 'Where (ποῦ) is the child who has been born king of the Jews?' (2:2) and the second by King Herod, 'he inquired of them [the chief priests and scribes of the people] where (ποῦ) the Messiah was to be born.' (2:4). An astute reader/hearer recognizes that the two questions, while similar in content, are quite different in intent and motive. This becomes evident in light of the earlier response of Herod and 'all Jerusalem with him' to the 'troubling' (ἐταράχθη)[51] news of the magi. The questions contrast the

---

[50] Who offers the quote affects little the authority. The significance is in the authority of the biblical tradition, Davies and Allison 3:577 point out.

[51] BDAGταράσσω—**1.** lit. *stir up*—**2.** fig. *stir up, disturb, trouble, throw into confusion.* Matthew's only other usage of this term is the account in 14:26 when the disciples are 'troubled' (ἐταράχθησαν) by the

sincere seeking of the Magi with the deceptive, untrustworthy and unpredictable character of the current king.

For these three reasons, Mt 2:6 is not a 'formula quotation', but it is still a quotation. More specifically, it is a compound or composite quote from Micah 5:2(1) and II Samuel 5:2.

As noted, the quotation in 2:6 is a compound or composite quote from Micah 5:2(1) and II Samuel 5:2. Matthew's wording of Mic 5:2(1) does not follow any known text form, Hebrew or Greek. Apparently Matthew 'targumizes' Mic 5:2(1) for his own purposes and understands what he is doing as a valid exegetical approach. The traditional *targum* does understand Mic 5:2(1)[52] as messianic and by mentioning Bethlehem, Matthew reminds the reader/hearer of David. In order to remove all doubt that this is a messianic quote and the Messiah is David's son, Matthew by quoting II Samuel 5:2, follows almost verbatim the LXX:

Mt 2:6,	ὅστις ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ἰσραήλ.
LXX II Sam 5:2,	σὺ ποιμανεῖς τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ισραηλ
LXX II Chr 11:2,	σὺ ποιμανεῖς τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ισραηλ[53]

For those who recognized the compound quote from Mic 5:2(1) and II Sam 5:2, the language of a ruler who will 'shepherd my people Israel' would have conjured up Messianic and eschatological expectations.[54] It may also have been significant for Matthew that the Samuel quotation makes a reference to 'My people, Israel' (τὸν λαόν

---

storm. Herod and 'all' Jerusalem are troubled by the magi's report and possibly sense another kind of 'storm' is coming as a result of this news.

[52] *Tg. Mic. 5:1* refers to the coming Messiah. Cf. also *Tg. Ps.-J.* on Gen 35:21.

[53] As noted earlier the parallel text in I Chr 11:2 is identical with II Sam 5:2, so is only mentioned here for the sake of completeness.

[54] Davies and Allison 1:243. 'To a first-century Jew, reference to a ruler come forth to "shepherd my people Israel" would have conjured up the eschatological expectation of the ingathering of the twelve tribes of Israel (cf. Ezek 34.4-16; Mic 5:1-9; Ps. Sol. 17; 4 Ezra 13. 34-50; 2 Bar. 77-86; *m. Sanh.* 10.3), an expectation apparently shared by Matthew (19:28)'.

μου τὸν Ισραηλ), an important theme throughout his gospel.[55] In the context of the narrative, the quote also calls into question the lineage of Herod who is an Edomite, thereby challenging the legitimacy of the current king of the Jews.

As to the immediate context of Micah one might ask, 'Why does the evangelist not go on to quote the rest of Mic 5:2 and even 5:4 which continues to the shepherd theme?' In light of Matthew's genealogy of Jesus, Micah's reference to one whose 'origin is from of old' and one from the 'ancient days' (Mic 5:2) would have fit in nicely. Even Micah's statements about 'the time when she who is in labour has brought forth' and 'his kindred shall return,' (Mic 5:3) might have been made to relate to Mt 1:18-25. Furthermore, Mic 5:4 portrays the shepherd who 'assertively' (lit.'stands,' στήσεται) provides security and peace for the flock as they are shepherded in the strength of the Lord. If the surrounding context of Micah is considered, in light of the special Matthean vocabulary,[56] what emerges is an image of the shepherd:

> who is to *rule* (ἄρχοντα) in Israel,
> whose *origin is from of old*,
> from *ancient days*. (καὶ αἱ ἔξοδοι αὐτοῦ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἐξ ἡμερῶν αἰῶνος)...
> ...the rest of *his kindred shall return* (τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιστρέψουσιν)
> to the people of Israel.
> ...And *he shall stand and feed his flock in the strength of the LORD*, (καὶ στήσεται καὶ ὄψεται καὶ ποιμανεῖ τὸ ποίμνιον αὐτοῦ ἐν ἰσχύι κυρίου)
> ...he shall be great to the ends of the earth; and he shall be the one of *peace*.

Why does Matthew not quote more of Micah 5? Of course there is no definitive answer. Matthew does not tell us. But maybe the reader/hearer is supposed to remember and explore the broader context and 'fill in for themselves.'[57] This is only to reflect upon the immediate verses in the context of Micah 5 but the prophet uses the

---

[55] λαός: 14 times and seems to always refer to Israel as the people of God, Cf. Luz 1:130; in contrast to: τὰ ἔθνη. Cf. Davies and Allison 1:81.

[56] For the sources of 'favorite or special expressions' of Matthew: Cf. Davies and Allison 1:74-85; Gundry (1994) 641-649; Luz 1:35-53. When a term is identified as important to Matthew the statistics are given in order of the synoptic Gospels: Mt; Mk; Lk.

[57] Davies and Allison 1:244 also agree.

shepherd/sheep/flock metaphor throughout his book (cf. Mic 5:1-5; 7:14 and also 2:12-13; 4:8).

Alas, this is not the direction Matthew takes. He stops short and introduces II Sam 5:2. By so doing, he focuses directly on Matthew's Davidic Christology and encompasses another theme as well, τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ἰσραήλ.[58] Davidic Christiology may be primary, but both themes are important from a Matthean point of view. Another possible connection, though not often noted in the commentaries, is the last part of II Sam 5:2,

which Matthew does not quote but may assume the reader/hearer will connect. '....you who shall be *ruler* over Israel.' (αἰ σὺ ἔσει εἰς ἡγούμενον[59] ἐπὶ τὸν Ισραηλ). David is the ruler (ἡγούμενον) that comes from Bethlehem according to Micah in order to rule (ἡγούμενος) as shepherd according to II Samuel 5:2. So again, though not quoted, there is an obvious linguistic linkage in II Sam 5:2.

The broader context of II Samuel 5 includes the narrative describing how David emerged as King over 'all of Israel and Judah' (5:5). It culminates with the messianic promise given to David and his descendents in II Samuel 7. The Lord through the prophet Nathan establishes David as 'prince (ἡγούμενον) over my people Israel' (ἐπὶ τὸν λαόν μου ἐπὶ τὸν Ισραηλ) and his descendents an everlasting dynasty:

> But I will not take my steadfast love from him,...Your house and your kingdom shall be made sure for ever before me; your throne shall be established for ever. (II Sam 7:15-16)

---

[58] So Rothfuchs (1969) 61 and Luz 1:130 emphasize this aspect of the quote. Soares Prabhu (1976) 266 disagrees in favor of the Davidic Christology: 'Matthew has added 2 Sam 5,2 to Mic 5,1 not because it speaks about ὁ λαός but because it is a text about David, and so explicitly identifies Jesus as the "son of David" in whom the promises made to David are to be fulfilled. It is explicitly as the "Son of David" (1:1) that Jesus is born in David's city, Bethlehem'.

[59] Mt terms: 10; 1; 2. ἡγεμών/ἡγέομαι—1. *lead, guide* pres. participle ὁ ἡγούμενος *ruler, leader* Mt 2:6.

Among a number of possible intertextual echoes,[60] two from the prophet Ezekiel may be noted. Ez. 34:23-24 reads:

> I will set up over them *one shepherd*, my servant David, and *he shall feed them*: he shall feed them and be their *shepherd.* And I, the LORD, will be their God, and my servant David shall be *prince* among them; I, the LORD, have spoken.
>
> LXX: καὶ ἀναστήσω ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ποιμένα ἕνα καὶ ποιμανεῖ αὐτούς τὸν δοῦλόν μου Δαυιδ καὶ ἔσται αὐτῶν ποιμήν. καὶ ἐγὼ κύριος ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς εἰς θεόν καὶ Δαυιδ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν ἄρχων ἐγὼ κύριος ἐλάλησα.

Similar to this reference is Ez 37:24-25 where the Davidic Messiah 'shall be king/prince (ἄρχων)...and they shall have one shepherd (ποιμὴν εἷς)'. The exilic prophet Ezekiel refers to the Davidic dynasty promised in II Sam 7 when he speaks twice in chapter 34 and twice in 37 of 'my servant David.' In both instances, David is God's shepherd and shall be 'prince' (the LXX here uses ἄρχων[61] throughout rather than ἡγούμενον[62]) among God's people. Why Matthew does not use ἄρχων may be that it can be used or understood negatively, which Matthew does of evil spirits (e.g. 9:34; 12:24), but ἡγούμενον is not so used.

7.2.2.2 Mt 2:11 and Ps 72:10-11, 15

The intent and attitude of the magi in their seeking the king of the Jews (2:2) finds fulfillment in 2:11 and for Matthew fulfills allusions found in Psalm 72. The biblical tradition that the Gentile nations would in the latter days ultimately recognize God's rule is depicted in the magi story.[63] The magi symbolize the Gentiles who,

---

[60] Jer 23:5-6; Ezek 34.4-16; Ps. Sol. 17; 4 Ezra 13. 34-50; 2 Bar. 77-86.

[61] BDAGἄρχων, οντος, ὁ *ruler, lord, prince* Mt 20:25; Ac 4:26; Rv 1:5. Of *authorities, officials* gener., both Jewish Mt 9:18; Lk 8:41; 14:1; 18:18; J 3:1; Ac 3:17 and Gentile Ac 16:19. Of evil spirits Mt 9:34; 12:24; Lk 11:15; J 12:31; 14:30; Eph 2:2.

[62] BDAGἡγέομαι—**1.** *ruler, leader* Mt 2:6.

[63] E.g. the two texts alluded to here: Ps 72 and Isa 60. Cf. e.g. Isa 2:1-4; 43:5-10; Mic 4:1-4; *Ps. Sol.* 17:31.

unlike the Jewish leaders depicted here in the narrative, show themselves receptive and responsive to God's salvation.[64] Matthew 2:11 reads:

> On entering the house, they saw the child with Mary his mother; and they knelt down and paid him homage. Then, opening their treasure chests, they offered him gifts of gold, frankincense, and myrrh.
>
> καὶ ἐλθόντες εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν εἶδον τὸ παιδίον μετὰ Μαρίας τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ πεσόντες προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀνοίξαντες τοὺς θησαυροὺς αὐτῶν προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ δῶρα, χρυσὸν καὶ λίβανον καὶ σμύρναν.

In regard to the biblical allusion concerning the magi, of particular interest is Mt 2:11b, which alludes to two texts: LXX Ps 72(71):10-11,15 and LXX Isa 60:6-7. According to Gundry, 'the general nature of Matthean allusions are a "mixed text-form" much like the Matthean quotations. The allusive quotations peculiar to Matthew will display the same mixed text-form that is prominent in all the other groups of quotations except the formal citations in common with Mk'.[65]

Similar to the compound quote above from Micah and Samuel, a composite allusion occurs in Ps 72 and Isa 60. These texts offer further insight into Matthew's understanding of the significance of the Magi story and the birth of Jesus.

Psalm 72 is a royal Psalm and in Judaism is understood to be messianic.[66] Linguistically, the allusions offer a number of links. In this regard, Gundry notes, 'Except for πεσόντες, which Matthew likes to add to προσκυνέω, and σμύρναν, all of

---

[64] Gundry (1967) 129-130, 'This OT allusion buttresses Matthew's purpose of showing that the Messiah, rejected by his own nation, has been received by the Gentiles. Sheba, mentioned in both OT passages, was a region of Arabia and noted for its gold and spices. (cf. Ps 72:15; I Kings 10:1ff; Ex 27:22; Herodotus iii. 107; Strabo XVI. iv. 25) The earliest tradition traces the Magi to Arabia. (cf. Tert., *Adv. Marc.*, iii. 13. 8)'. Cf. Davies and Allison 1:228, who seem to lean toward Arabia, but between the three options of Arabia, Babylon and Persia acknowledge that 'A choice among these three alternatives is impossible, although if 2.11 does allude to Isa 60:6, one would be inclined to opt for Arabia, for that OT text speaks of Midian and Sheba (cf. also Ps 72.10)'. 228.

[65] Gundry (1967) 127.

[66] Cf. Davies and Allison 1:250 and also n. 61, 'The targum makes the psalm messianic'. Cf. *The Aramaic Bible, vol. 16, Tg. Ps.* 139-140. E.g. v 1, 'By Solomon, *it was said in prophecy:* O God, give *the halakhoth of* your justice to the *anointed* (משיח) king, and your righteousness to the son of *King David*'.

Matthew's words are paralleled in the LXX'.[67] Among a number of possible connections, Ps 72:10-11 and 72:15 stand out because they describe Gentile kings bringing tribute and gifts and offering prayer and blessing to the Messiah.

> [10]May the kings of Tarshish and of the isles
> *render him tribute* (δῶρα προσοίσουσιν[68]),
> may the *kings of Sheba and Seba*
> *bring gifts*. (βασιλεῖς Ἀράβων καὶ Σαβα δῶρα προσάξουσιν)
> [11]May all *kings fall down before him* (καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν[69] αὐτῷ πάντες οἱ βασιλεῖς),
> *all nations give him service* (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη δουλεύσουσιν αὐτῷ).
> [15]Long may he live!
> May *gold* (χρυσίου) *of Sheba* (τῆς Ἀραβίας) be given to him.
> May *prayer* (προσεύξονται) be made for him continually,
> and *blessings* (εὐλογήσουσιν) invoked for him all day long.

In these allusions (as confirmed by Is 60), Matthew communicates that this newborn child is not only king of the Jews but king of the whole human race. The most fitting response is προσκυνήσουσιν by πάντα τὰ ἔθνή, which is contrasted with the hostile response of Herod and the lack of response on the part of Israel's leaders.[70]

When the broader context of the whole Psalm is considered, a number of Matthean themes may be discerned:

1) Righteousness is a major theme that Matthew shares in common with Ps 72 (see τὴν δικαιοσύνην in LXX Ps 72: 1,2,3)[71]. The 'king's son' (ᾧ υἱῷ τοῦ βασιλέως) will exercise righteous judgment and defend the poor and those who need an advocate.

---

[67] Gundry (1967) 130.

[68] Mt term: 14; 3; 4. *προσφέρω*—**1.** act. and pass. *bring (to)* e.g. Mt 4:24; 9:2, 32; 17:16; 19:13; 25:20;—**2.** *bring, offer, present*—**a.** lit. Mt 2:11; 5:23f.

[69] Mt term: 13; 2; 3. προσκυνέω *(fall down and) worship, do obeisance to, prostrate oneself before, do reverence to, welcome respectfully* depending on the object—**1.** to human beings Mt 18:26; Ac 10:25; Rv 3:9.—**2.** to God Mt 4:10; J 4:20f, 23f; 12:20; Ac 24:11; 1 Cor 14:25; Hb 11:21; Rv 4:10; 14:7; 19:4.—**2.** to foreign deities Ac 7:43.—**3.** to the Devil and Satanic beings Mt 4:9; Lk 4:7; Rv 9:20; 13:4; 14:9, 11.—**4.** to angels Rv 22:8.—*5. to Christ Mt 2:2, 8, 11; 8:2; 9:18; 14:33; 15:25; 20:20; 28:9, 17*; Mk 5:6; 15:19; Lk 24:52.

[70] Hagner 31.

[71] Mt terms: δίκαιος 17; 2; 11. δικαιοσύνη 7; 0; 1. δικαιοσύνη, ης, ἡ *righteousness, uprightness* Mt 5:6; Ac 24:25; Ro 9:30; Phil 3:6; Tit 3:5; *religious requirement* Mt 3:15. *Mercy, charitableness* Mt 6:1.

Note how the Psalmist links righteousness and justice (which in v 2 Matthew also links):

'May he *judge* (κρίνειν[72]) *your people with righteousness* (τὸν λαόν σου ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ), and *your poor* (τοὺς πτωχούς) with *justice* (κρίσει)'. Also, note the theme of justice and judgment (v2) that will later be a characteristic of the shepherd in Mt 25: 31-32.

In the first seven verses of Ps 72, the 'king's son' is characterized as a righteous king who will provide the 'prosperity' of a noble king and 'defend' and 'deliver' the 'poor' and 'needy' from those who, under less 'just' rule, have been 'oppressed.' This quality of the true 'righteousness' that 'exceeds' a pretended display of religious behavior (5:20) is an important Matthean theme in regard to Jesus and his kingdom (6:33).[73]

2) There is also the contrast between the strong and the weak, the powerful and the oppressed, in the last part of Ps 72:12-14. V 12a:'For he *delivers the needy* when they call (ἐρρύσατο[74] πτωχὸν)'. V 14:'From *oppression and violence he redeems* (ἐκ τόκου καὶ ἐξ ἀδικίας λυτρώσεται) their life; *and precious is their blood* (MT: דָּמָם = blood = LXX: τὸ ὄνομα) *in his sight* (καὶ ἔντιμον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῶν ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ)'. One might imagine, in the aftermath of the slaughter of the holy innocents (2:13-23), that even these verses took on special meaning.

---

[72] Mt term: 12; 0; 4. κρίσις, εως, ἡ—1. *judging, judgment* Mt 10:15; Lk 10:14; J 5:30; 2 Th 1:5; Hb 9:27; 2 Pt 2:9; Jd 6. κρίσιν ποιεῖν *act as judge* J 5:27. *Condemnation, punishment* Mt 23:33; J 5:24, 29; Hb 10:27; Js 5:12; Rv 18:10; 19:2.—**2.** *board of judges, local court* Mt 5:21f.—**3.** *right* in the sense of *justice, righteousness* Mt 12:18, 20; 23:23; Lk 11:42. This meaning is also possible for J 7:24; 12:31; Ac 8:33 and others. κρίμα, ατος, τό *Judging, judgment* Mt 7:2.

[73] δίκαιος: just, righteous (1:19; 5:45; 13:49; 27:19, 24); δικαιοσύνη: righteousness (3:15; 5:6; 5:10; 5:20; 6:1; 6:33; 21:32).

[74] ὑομαι *save, rescue, deliver* Mt 6:13; 27:43.

3) Another theme is the time of the Messiah is one of abundance (LXX Ps 72:5-7, 16-17). The time of the Messiah is a 'greater' time of blessing than any other time. This theme is highlighted in Mt 12:40ff, where Messiah is greater than Jonah, greater than Solomon; or to put it another way, the Messiah is 'superlative' in terms of time and in terms of individuals.

4) Blessing is another theme shared by Matthew and Ps 72. Notice Ps 72: 17b:'May *all nations be blessed in him* (καὶ εὐλογηθήσονται ἐν αὐτῷ πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαι)', which connects to the Abrahamic theme in Matthew's first chapter.

Following 72:15 is a description of blessings of the messianic age in 16-17 and then (18-20) the doxology for the second book (Psalms 42-72)[75] of the Psalms as a whole.

(5) Lastly, both Matthew and Ps 72 share an eschatological vision. Both envision the nations coming in response to the Messiah's righteous and just rule. The coming of the Gentiles is never conceived of as judgment upon Israel or those in the land, but rather as a kind of vindication and exaltation of Israel (cf Mt 8:11-12).

So, with these five themes in view, there are at least two things Matthew wants his reader/hearer to bring to mind from Psalm 72:

(1) The Magi play the role of the nations coming to the Messiah. In their witness to the Davidic messianic king of the Jews, they fulfill the biblical promises, being 'those from Sheba who will come', who will bring to Jerusalem the wealth of the nations, gold and silver, as the glory of the Lord rises upon her (Isa 60.3-6; cf. Ps, 72.10-11, 15; cf. vs 11).[76]

---

[75] According to Wilson (1986; 1993) the editors of the Psalms intentionally framed the first three books of the Psalms with royal Psalms: 1-2 & 41; 42 & 72; 73 & 89. Psalm 72 being one of these royal Psalms.

[76] Davies and Allison 1:231.

(2) More importantly, the whole Ps speaks to the character and concerns of the Messiah which include righteousness, the poor, justice, abundance, etc. and also exercising mercy and justice with righteous judgment.

7.2.2.3 Mt 2:11 and Isa 60:6-7[77]

This is an explicitly eschatological passage with its emphasis on the nations coming to the 'light' (Isa 60:1-3) and kings coming to the 'light' (star). Starting with Isaiah 60:9, the Gentile nations are in focus (cf. also 10-12). The people of the nations come offering adoration and homage. The glory of the messianic age is alluded to in v.13 and following.[78] The emphasis of these allusions and their implications remind us again of the message of Matthew 1:1. Jesus the Christ is not only the Son of David but also the son of Abraham or the one who fulfills the Abrahamic promise that through him all the nations will be blessed. The theme of both Psalm 72 and Isa 60 is of all the nations coming and participating in the righteous and just rule of the Davidic king which is in fulfillment of the Abrahamic promise in Gen. 12:1-3.

Isaiah 60: 1-2

> Arise, shine; *for your light has come*, (ἥκει γάρ σου τὸ φῶς)
> and the glory of the LORD has *risen upon you.*(καὶ ἡ δόξα κυρίου ἐπὶ σὲ ἀνατέταλκεν[79])...but the LORD will arise upon you (δὲ σὲ φανήσεται[80] κύριος)

---

[77] Gundry (1967) 206. 'Mt 2:11 alludes to Is 60:6. But allusions to the last chapters of Is (outside the boundaries of Dodd's text-plots) are very numerous throughout the NT'.

[78] Cf. Ps. 110:3 cf. Davies and Allison 1:251. Also Song of Sol. 3:6; cf 4:6 Goulder (1976) 236, proposes the myrrh is drawn from the Song of Sol., 'Who is this that comes up from the wilderness, sensed with myrrh and frankincense? (σμύρναν καὶ λίβανον) Behold Solomon's bed'.

[79] Cf. Mt term: ἀνατολή, 5; 0; 2. Cf. 2:1, 2, 9; but in direct relation to the magi story is this comment about Abraham, sons of the kingdom etc. 8:11-12; Cf. also 4:16; 5:45; 13:16 and 24:27. Mt term: (8; 1; 2). ἀνατέλλω—1. *cause to rise* Mt 5:45.—2. intrans. *spring up, rise* Mt 13:6; Mk 16:2; 2 Pt 1:19; *dawn* Mt 4:16. *Come up* Lk 12:54. *Be descended* Hb 7:14. cf. ἀνατολή, ῆς, ἡ—1. *rising* of a star: ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ *in its rising, when it rose* Mt 2:2.—2. *rising* of the sun, *East, Orient* Mt 2:1; 8:11; Rv 7:2; 21:13. Fig. ἀ. ἐξ ὕψους *the dawn from heaven,* i.e. the Messiah Lk 1:78. *Anatolia.* Cf. ἀνατέλλω.

[80] Mt term: 13; 1; 2. φαίνομαι—to become visible, *appear,* pass. φαίνομαι w. act./intr. Sense.

In light of the unique use of ἀνατέταλκεν ('has risen') and in light of the important way in which Matthew uses this term in the story of Magi, it is obvious that this sets the tone for the rest of the passage.[81]

LXX Isa 60:3-4, 6b

> *Nations shall come to your light,* (καὶ πορεύσονται βασιλεῖς τῷ φωτι)
> and *kings to the brightness of your dawn.* (σου καὶ ἔθνη τῇ λαμπρότητί σου)
> Lift up your eyes and look around; they all *gather together,* (συνηγμένα[82]) they come to you;(ἰδοὺ[83] ἥκασιν πάντες οἱ υἱοί).
> *They shall bring gold and frankincense* (ἥξουσιν φέροντες χρυσίον καὶ λίβανον οἴσουσιν)
> *and shall proclaim the praise of the* LORD.(καὶ τὸ σωτήριον κυρίου εὐαγγελιοῦνται)

Matthew's linguistic links with Psalm 72 and Isa 60 indicate that Matthew views the coming of the magi as fulfillment of Israel's Messianic hopes. Jesus, the Son of David and the newborn king of the Jews, is the Shepherd King born in Bethlehem in the lineage of David, something confirmed in the royal Psalm 72. The Psalm and Isaiah 60 both point to a Messiah who is a Shepherd King/Leader of Israel and the nations. The Messiah will bless and incorporate the nations by way of the promises given to Abraham. He is a royal and righteous shepherd king that will set right the injustices carried out by both the evil kings and leadership of Israel and the false kings of Israel and the nations.

7.2.3 Contextual Analysis of Mt 2:1-11

The purpose of this section is to synthesize the previous material and propose Matthew's perspective on the shepherd metaphor. In light of the textual (7.2.1) and intertextual connections (7.2.2), the compound quote of 2:6 and the allusions to Psalm

---

[81] ἀνατολή, ῆς, ἡ—1. *rising* of a star: ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ *in its rising, when it rose* Mt 2:2.—2. *rising* of the sun, *East, Orient* Mt 2:1; 8:11; Rv 7:2; 21:13. Fig. ἀ. ἐξ ὕψους *the dawn from heaven,* i.e. the Messiah Lk 1:78. *Anatolia.* Cf. ἀνατέλλω.

[82] Mt term: συνάγω 24; 5; 6. Cf. Mt use: συναγωγή/-αί αὐτῶν/ὑμῶν 6; 2; 1. συνάγω—1. *gather (in), gather up* Mt 13:47; 25:24, 26.—2. *bring* or *call together, gather* Mt 22:10; 25:32;.—3. *invite* or *receive as a guest* Mt 25:35, 38, 43.—4. *advance, move* Mt 20:28

[83] Mt term: 62; 7; 57.

72 and Isaiah 60 demonstrate from Matthew's perspective that the newborn king of the Jews is the royal-righteous shepherd, in the lineage of the son of David, the one who brings to fulfillment the promise to Abraham that through him all the world will be blessed. The use of 2:6 functions for Matthew as one of the main arguments for Jesus' right to be king of the Jews. His comparison between the response of the magi and the responses of the other characters in the story, especially Herod, make it a story of both acceptance and rejection[84]

7.2.3.1 Use of Comparison

One of the literary devices at work in the magi story is σύγκρισις (comparison).[85] This standard rhetorical technique allows Matthew to challenge the reader/hearer to make a decision by contrasting the main characters in the narrative. His first century readers/hearers would have been aware of the strategy of σύγκρισις. In Matthew's account they would have understood who were the greater and the lesser characters in the narrative and would have felt a need to decide whose side they represented. Matthew will also use σύγκρισις in regard to other notable characters like Moses, Solomon, Jonah and even John the Baptist.[86]

The Gentile magi come seeking the newborn king of the Jews while the Jewish leadership, who know about the prophecies do nothing in response to the news. The current King of the Jews pretends to be sympathetic (Mt 2: 7) but the reader/hearer senses all along the deception of his intentions. The searching leads to discovery, and the magi respond with προσκυνήσουσιν (worship) as the biblical tradition affirms they should, while the current king responds by trying to destroy the newborn king.

---

[84] Hagner 1:24; Davis and Allison 1:225 'In chapters 1-2 the evangelist is concerned with events preceding and following the birth of Jesus;...circumstances surrounding Jesus' conception and entrance into the Davidic line (1:1-25) and with people's response to the advent of the child Messiah (2:1-23)'.
[85] Stanton (1993) 77-80, 83.
[86] Stanton (1993) 80-83.

Jesus and Herod are compared in at least two other ways. Herod, as the current 'king of the Jews', had no royal lineage and is contrasted with Jesus in light of his royal genealogy and association with the house of David. Jesus is further described by the genealogy in chapter one and the combined scriptural quotation concerning the hoped for Messiah from Micah five and David as the shepherd of Israel who ruled well (I Sam 5:2). Not only is the rule and kingdoms of the two contrasted but also their character is subtly contrasted. Herod attempts deception of the magi and shows his hypocrisy when he says he wants also to come and worship (προσκυνήσω αὐτῷ, Mt 2:7) and the reader/hearer soon learns the evil intent of Herod, who will try to kill the Davidic Shepherd-Messiah. This is similar to Pharaoh of Jewish tradition who tried to kill God's first deliverer, Moses. At this point in Matthew's story, the character of Jesus has not yet been demonstrated. But, as the newborn king, he is depicted as the one who has received righteousness (Ps 72:1, τὴν δικαιοσύνην) as the 'king's son' in the allusion to Psalm 72 and therefore worthy of gifts and homage by the magi (72:10-11, 15). Further, for the reader/hearer who knows the end of the story, they are reminded that the only other time the phrase 'King of the Jews' is used in Matthew is in the passion narrative concerning the 'smitten shepherd-redeemer' who will deliver his people with his life.

The second way Jesus and Herod are compared concerns typology. The typological correspondence is that the coming one who will shepherd Israel is a righteous shepherd like Moses.[87] In the typology, Herod is the anti-shepherd and compared with Pharaoh. The evil response of the current king Herod is that he initiates and is responsible for killing 'all the children in and around Bethlehem who were two

[87] Allison (1993) 140-165. 'The existence of a Moses typology in Matt. 1-2 has been affirmed by many modern commentators, and rightly so'. Cf. his seven Appendices, 292-328 dealing with the scholarship on the Moses typology in the infancy narratives.

years old or under' (2:16). This occurs in the third act of the infancy narrative (2:13-23) and is anticipated in the secrecy and dishonesty of Herod in 2:7-8, 12. The infancy narrative's intertextual and typological connection of the one 'who is to shepherd my people' with David and Moses makes perfect sense when we remember that both were understood in the tradition as being shepherds whom God used to bring deliverance to the people and to fulfill the promised eschatological hope.[88] The Moses/exodus tradition is being introduced and will be developed in Matthew 2:13-23. I believe Matthew wants the reader/hearer to recognize these connections between the Moses/exodus tradition, the royal Davidic tradition and the prophetic traditions as they relate to the shepherd metaphor.

The legitimacy of Jesus as the shepherd king has been part of the author's intention since Mt 1:1 ('the genealogy of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham') and will continue throughout the Gospel. Here in the infancy narrative, Jesus as shepherd king is highlighted in the shepherd text of Mt 2:6.[89] It is well documented that Matthew focuses on Jesus as king and son of David throughout the Gospel, but the shepherd king motif has been neglected in comparison. The fulfillment of Jesus' kingship as the true shepherd of God's people is given divine authority and approval in use of the biblical tradition. Jesus is king by lineage and prophetic approval and now by fulfillment. The magi story emphasizes the Davidic connection. The next narrative (Mt 2:13-23), based upon the 'fulfillment' formula quotations, will illuminate further how Jesus is like the Moses of old. The Moses typology will come to the fore again in Mt 9:36 and it will be argued that Jesus is a shepherd like Moses. Herod, in Mt 2:7-8, is already introduced in the magi narrative as playing the role of

[88] For examples of this tradition cf. Ps 77:20, 78:70-72.
[89] As noted earlier, cf. ref. to Judah, 1:2-3 and land of Judah, 2:1,5,6 2 times; 'David the King' 1:6 and 'king of the Jews' 2:2 Joseph, son of David 1:20; and Bethlehem 2:1, 5, 6, 8.

the ancient Egyptian Pharaoh who tries to destroy the infant savior and deliverer (Moses). This ties together Mt 2:13-23 and Mt 1:18-25 through typological correspondence. Herod becomes the anti-shepherd or false shepherd in the narrative while the newborn king of the Jews is anticipated. The implication for our purposes, in the biblical tradition, is that David is the royal shepherd king par excellence and Moses is the righteous shepherd deliverer par excellence and Jesus now becomes the righteous royal shepherd and, by God's design according to Matthew, he 'outshines' them both.

Finally, the quotations from Mic 5 and II Sam 5 and the allusions from Ps 72 and Isa 60 affirm the observations made above. First, the compound-quote of 2:6 points to the validity of Jesus as king of the Jews: the shepherd of Israel in the lineage of David who will take his rightful place as king and rule God's people as the true Son of David. From Psalm 72 and Isaiah 60, the character and the universal nature of this kingship are established. As David's son, the character of this rule is to be one of righteousness and justice. It will provide prosperity and justice even for the poor and needy. Those who have been previously taken advantage of will now be defended and delivered. The eschatological dimension of this kingship is promised not only to the people of God but this will also be extended to the Gentiles. So, according to the intertextual quotations and allusions, Jesus is depicted in Matthean terms as the royal and righteous shepherd king, son of David and Messiah of Israel and son of Abraham; the one who will bless all the nations with salvation (Mt 1:1).

7.2.4 Metaphor Analysis of Mt 2:6

The metaphor analysis of each of the shepherd texts will generally proceed along the same lines.[90] Each passage will be considered by identifying the *tenor/topic*, *vehicle* and *frame* of the shepherd metaphor.[91] Second, there will be a discussion of how the metaphor functions in Matthew specifically.[92] Along with this, how Matthew's intertextual use of the biblical tradition may or may not *extend* the implications of the shepherd metaphor will be discusssed.[93] Finally, how Jesus is being *depicted* (vs. defined) by Matthew's use of the metaphor will be addressed.

It is Matthew 2:6b that is under consideration here:

...for from you shall come a ruler who is to shepherd my people Israel.
ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ ἐξελεύσεται ἡγούμενος, ὅστις ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ἰσραήλ.

The incongruous terms are 'ruler' (*tenor/topic*) and 'shepherd' (*vehicle*) and together these create the *focus* of the metaphor, a shepherd-ruler. The *frame*, as has been argued above,[94] includes a royal context contrasting righteous and unrighteous responses to the shepherd image (cf. the 'troubled' and deceptive responses of 2:3, 8, 11). Thus, the *focus* of the metaphor may also be said to imply a shepherd-king.

The context of the biblical quotation in Matthew 2:6 comes in response to the magi search for 'the King of the Jews' (Mt 2:2). There is a contrast between the child who has been born King of the Jews with the current would be king, Herod. As argued above[95] Matthew 2:6 is a compound quote from Micah 5:2(1) and II Samuel 5:2. The combination of these two texts emphasizes the royal character of the shepherd metaphor as applied to Jesus. Herod, an Edomite, is not from the royal line of David.

---

[90] For the theory of metaphor used in this thesis cf. chapter 3.1.3 above.
[91] Cf. chapter 3.1.3.2.
[92] Cf. chapter 3.1.3.2.1.
[93] Cf. chapter 3.1.3.2.2.
[94] Cf. 7.2.1 above.
[95] Cf. 7.2.2.1 above.

So, the Matthean narrative utilizes the shepherd metaphor to focus on the royal implications.

Further, when the intertextual contexts of the compound quotation of Matthew 2:6 and the allusions to other biblical texts (for example, Psalm 72 and Isaiah 60) are taken into account, Matthew extends and develops the royal shepherd metaphor even further.[96] Again, in contrast to Herod in the narrative, the royal shepherd metaphor is extended through the intertextual connections with Psalm 72 and Isaiah 60. The royal aspect of the shepherd image is further characterized by righteousness, justice and mercy to the poor and a rule of abundance and blessing. Both in the royal Psalm and in Isaiah 60 this royal shepherd will rule not only over 'my people (τὸν λαόν) Israel' (Mt 2:6) but also over 'all the nations' (τὰ ἔθνη) (Ps 72:11; Is 60:3).[97] What we have in Matthew's intertextual use of the biblical tradition is the introduction of linguistic associations that contribute to and inform the cognitive force of the shepherd metaphor. For the gospel writer the specific intertextual references are also meant to evoke these broader cognitive associations in order to establish a constellation of ideas informing the basic shepherd metaphor.[98] Matthew's use of the shepherd metaphor from the biblical tradition in this context is meant to challenge the reader/hearer to compare and contrast and, in so doing, to persuade and convince the informed reader/hearer that the child that was born is the Shepherd-Messiah of the biblical tradition in contrast to the tradition of the evil shepherds.

---

[96] Cf. chapter 2.4.2.2 for general methodology; 7.2.2.2 and 7.2.2.3 above for specific application.

[97] Cf. the discussion above in 7.2.2.1where it was noted that Mt uses τὸν λαόν consistently to refer to Israel (14 times) and τὰ ἔθνη for Gentiles (or some form of ἔθνος, 15 times).

[98] Kittay (1987) 90, speaks 'of metaphor extended through a text—but the resources available can be exploited for the expanded metaphors that are not confined to a single text. Whether we deal with textual metaphors or language-pervasive metaphors, we encounter the significance of the metaphorical move. Metaphor is the linguistic realization of a leap of thought from one domain to another—in which the springboard is a structure-preserving mapping. The more we investigate metaphor, the more we become aware of how basic the movement is in language and in thought'.

In this way the shepherd metaphor is used by Matthew to depict who he believes Jesus to be. The interanimation between the ruler/king (*tenor/topic*) and the shepherd (*vehicle*) is the tension between the '*is—is not*' which creates the possibility for Matthew to give his particular portrayal of whom Jesus is to be in his birth and as the Gospel unfolds. The shepherd metaphor, which Matthew will explore at different points until the passion narrative, is initially established through the direct quotation in Matthew 2:6 and the image is then extended through the use of intertextuality. By this approach Matthew establishes a constellation of characteristics in order to depict what kind of shepherd-ruler/king Jesus is in his birth. In light of this analysis Matthew depicts Jesus as the messianic shepherd who is part of the royal linage of David, the Son of David. Likewise, according to the tradition of the righteous ruler/king he will shepherd Israel and the nations. As the Son of Abraham, Jesus who personifies the shepherd metaphor also demonstrates justice and mercy for all the nations.

This first section has been lengthy but we have considered a number of Matthean themes, literary techniques and unique linguistic usages that will also relate to the rest of the other four Matthean texts. We now turn to the next shepherd text in Mt 9:36.

7.3 Introduction and Structure of Mt 9:35-10:1

As we examine Matthew 9:36 and its context, we will continue to introduce and address special Matthean concerns as they are relevant to this section and the overall thesis. In regard to structure, the initial question to be addressed concerns the relationship between 9:35-38 and 10:1-4(or 5a[99]). Are the two pericopes to be understood as a unity or are they to be separated? Is 9:36-38 primarily a conclusion to what proceeds? Are chapters 5-9, and 10:1-4(5a) then the introduction to the second

[99] So Luz 2:60.

major discourse? Alternatively, are there reasons to understand the two to be a unity, both functioning together as a transition from the preceding and introducing that which is to come? The latter is the perspective that will be argued. This will be discussed in light of the overall literary structure of the Gospel; further arguments will be based on Matthean literary techniques.

In the literary structure of Matthew, the block of teaching in the Sermon on the Mount (5-7) and the healing narrative of chapters 8-9 make up a major section in the first part of the Gospel. The missionary discourse in chapter 10 will be the second major block of teaching. Structurally, the question is: How does Matthew move from one major section to the next? This question involves the relationship between 9:35-38 and the first part of chapter 10. Some understand 9:35-38 to be primarily the conclusion of the first section (chs. 5-9). Then, 10:1ff becomes the introduction to the missionary discourse of chapter 10.[100] Others argue that the two pericopes are a unity, which are transitional from the previous section and introductory to the missionary discourse. There are also differing opinions in regard to the beginning of the missionary discourse in chapter 10. Does the introduction to the discourse only include verses 1-4 or does it extend to verse 5a?[101] To rephrase the questions: are 9:35-38 only transitional and 10:1ff the beginning of the missionary discourse only? Or is 9:35-38, while functioning as a transition, to be closely connected as a unit with the introductory 10:1-4(5a)?

To consider these verses in light of the larger context of the Gospel may help clarify their function and relationship to one another. First, there is an *inclusio* or

---

[100] So, to varying degrees of separation, Carter (2000) 230-231; Gundry (1994); 180-181; Keener (1999); Bonhoeffer (2001) 183-185; all seem to propose the two pericopes of 9:35-38 and 10:1ff as distinct from each other and are not concerned to address whether they might be a unity.

[101] Understanding the two pericopes to be a unit: Davis and Allison 2:143; Hagner 1:259; Harrington (1991) 137. Nolland (2005) 406. Luz 2: 60, understands the two pericopes to be a unity but the second to extend to 10:5a.

'framing' technique created by nearly identical summaries of Jesus ministry in 4:23 and 9:35.[102] Structurally, the *inclusio* created by 4:23 and 9:35 alerts the reader/hearer to what has gone before and what lies ahead.[103] Davis and Allison use the analogy of a door:

> The explanation for the obvious resemblances with both 4:24-5:2 and 8:16-22 is this. 9:35-10:4 is a door that closes off one room and opens another. Structurally the pericope belongs equally to what comes before and to what comes after (just as one door belongs to two rooms)'.[104]

The *inclusio* alerts the reader/hearer to relate 9:35ff to the earlier 'hinge' passage, 4:23-5:2. The narrative section was closed in chapters 3-4 at 4:23-5:2 and the first major block of Jesus' teaching, the Sermon on the Mount was introduced. The healing narrative of chapters 8-9 is closed off at 9:35ff and the reader/hearer is introduced to the second block of instruction: the missionary discourse.

Along with these introductory indicators, there are also concluding formulaic phrases at the end of each of the five discourses. The terminology is exact in each instance. Each concludes with a reference to movement toward a geographical place which connects the repetitious phrase with both a concluding aspect and a syntactical element which functionally introduces the upcoming narrative: 'And it happened when Jesus had finished...'

7:28 Καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους,... then he 'entered Capernaum' 8:5.

---

[102] 4:23 and 9:35 are among a number of summaries that Matthew uses to further his purpose, the others being 8:16-17; 9:35-38; 12:15-16; 14:13-14; 34-36; 15:30-31; 19:1-2: 21:14-16. The summaries are a Matthean literary technique intended to provide movement in the narrative flow: they create a sense of narrative time; they also allow geographical allusions to be included, describing the extent and influence of Jesus ministry, indicating Jesus' activity and movement among the people. They also emphasize important Matthean theological distinctives by framing narratives and highlighting theme-setting episodes, as in the case with 4:23 and 9:35. Finally, the summaries remind the reader/hearer that Jesus did much more than is recorded in the Gospel and the reader/hearer is repeatedly reminded of the authority of Jesus' message and ministry.

[103] According to Gerhardson (1979) 20-21, Matthew's descriptions of Jesus' activity in 4:23-25 and 9:35 are meant to describe the whole of Jesus' ministry and outline 'the *programme* of Jesus' active ministry'.

[104] Davies and Allison 2:143.

11:1 Καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς διατάσσων τοῖς δώδεκα μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ,... into 'cities' 11:1.
13:53 Καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὰς παραβολὰς ταύτας,...'coming to his own country' 13:54.
19:1 Καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους,...'entered the region of Judea' 19:1.
26:1 Καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς πάντας τοὺς λόγους τούτους, εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· ...'at Bethany' 26:6.

Davies and Allison argue that the structure of 9:35-10:1-4 parallels 4:24-5:2.[105] First, both texts consist of two pericopes: the first has to do with Jesus and the multitude, 4:23-25//9:35-38; the second deals with Jesus and the disciples, 5:1-2//10:1-4. With understandable variations on the basis of Matthean vocabulary and redactional characteristics this further illustrates another literary technique to introduce intertextual connections even within his Gospel: 'the introduction to the Sermon on the Mount [4:23-5:2] has its closest parallels in the introductions to chapters 10, 13, 18, and 24-25.'[106]

There is another linguistic connection relating to 4:23 and 9:35. While forming the *inclusio,* these two verses are also linguistically connected with 10:1. This unites the two pericopes and also relates 10:1-4 to the larger context.

4:23— καὶ θεραπεύων πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν ἐν τῷ λαῷ.
9:35— καὶ θεραπεύων πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν.
10:1— καὶ θεραπεύειν πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν.

Structurally this Matthean redaction would seem to emphasize the close relation between 9:35-38 and 10:1-4. In light of the previous comments it does seem that there are valid reasons to think in terms of the unity of the two pericopes of 9:35-38 and 10:1-4. Together they function as a 'hinge' between the teaching and the healing narrative of chapters 5-9 and the second major discourse of chapter 10 anticipating the

[105] Luz 2:60 does as well. Cf. Davis and Allison 2:143. Matthew uses literary devices like the *inclusio* or repetition of formula phrases, the triad along with a number of other literary and linguistic devices in order to alert the reader/hearer to his interests, emphases and intentions. Cf. Nolland (2005) 23-29 for a helpful summary.
106 Davies and Allison 1:410-411

narrative of chapters 11-12. In comparison with chapters 8-9, the emphasis of the narrative of 11-12 is not on healing. (The account of the man with the withered hand in 12:9-14 is the one exception to this).

When 9:35-10:4 is understood in light of the larger context of what Jesus taught and did in the first major section (5-9) it now becomes clear that Jesus will extend his ministry through the disciples in chapter 10. This is partly in response to the need of the crowd, who are 'harassed and helpless' and leaderless plus the reality of the large harvest and lack of labors (9:37-38).[107] In response to this, the disciples are conferred with authority to participate in the ministry of Jesus in 10:1 (ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν) and are commissioned to proclaim the same message of the kingdom as Jesus proclaimed in 4:17:

4:17— ὁ Ἰησοῦς κηρύσσειν καὶ λέγειν· μετανοεῖτε· **ἤγγικεν γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.**
10:7—πορευόμενοι δὲ κηρύσσετε λέγοντες **ὅτι ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.**

Further, 9:36 echoes 5:1, again linking the two passages with the phase:

5:1—ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους
9:36—ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους

This continues the framing process established by Matthew in 9:35. Jesus' response in the first instance of seeing the crowds was to teach them. In this second reference, his response is one of compassion for the shepherdless of Israel who are 'harassed and helpless'. His command in light of this situation is petitionary prayer.[108]

7.3.1 Textual Analysis of Mt 9:35-38

These verses will be analyzed first by examining Matthew's own redactional uses of the two summary phrases from Mark 1:39 and 6:6b.[109] Matthean redaction will

---

[107] The 'laborers' (ἐργάτας) prayed for in 9:37-38; become a reality in 10:10 where the laborer (ὁ ἐργάτης) is sent forth to extend the message and ministry of Jesus.
[108] δεήθητε: an imperative aorist passive from δέομαι—to ask, pray or beg.
[109] Hagner 1:258-259.

also include, for example, the *inclusio* identified above, his fondness for the triad, the use here of the three participles, and the compassionate statement of Jesus concerning the crowds who are 'harassed and helpless'. Second, the textual analysis will involve Matthew's use of Mark 6:34 and the biblical reference to Numbers 27:17 and parallels. Finally, in turn, Matthew's use of Q and the harvest image in the last part of the pericope will be addressed.

There are differences between 4:23 and 9:35 but the similarities are greater. Matthew changes ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ, 'in the whole of Galilee', to τὰς πόλεις πάσας καὶ τὰς κώμας, 'all the cities and the villages'. Matthew also omits the last words of 4:23, ἐν τῷ λαῷ, 'among the people in 9:35.' Matthew's *inclusio* highlights both the teaching of Jesus (5-7) and the healing narrative (8-9) providing content and context to Jesus' 'proclamation of the good news of the kingdom'. The verbatim repetition of the two passages provides a formulaic summary of the ministry of Jesus. The highlighted text reveals the *inclusio.*

Mt 4:23 Καὶ περιῆγεν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν καὶ κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας καὶ θεραπεύων πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν ἐν τῷ λαῷ.	**Mt 9:35** Καὶ περιῆγεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὰς πόλεις πάσας καὶ τὰς κώμας διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν καὶ κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας καὶ θεραπεύων πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν.

Matthew's use of the triad is extensive both in terms of the structure of his Gospel and in more subtle ways.[110] Here he introduces the three participles and several words of description:

[110] Luz 1:38. 'The number *three* seems most important...One has to beware of interpreting it as to content, e.g., as a number of perfection. It is only a literary systematizing principle, one which is frequent in oral instruction.' Davies and Allison 1:62-72 discuss the use of the triad as it relates to the structure of the Gospel, concerning the five discourses on 62-66 and then his use of the triad in the narrative material on 66-72. They note approximately forty-four more uses of the triad outside of the discourses, 86-87, and this is still only a representative list.

διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν καὶ
κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας καὶ
θεραπεύων πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν.

The rhythm is fitting in light of the formulaic summary. Jesus' own message and ministry will now become the message and ministry of the disciples. Basic to the passage is Jesus passing on his authority and giving the commission to the disciples to participate in the message and work of the kingdom. Further, the mission of the twelve laid out in chapter 10 is to be characterized by Jesus' compassion for the crowds (v. 36). The task is too great for Jesus only, so his command for the disciples to 'go' (πορεύεσθε present imperative from πορεύομαι) to the lost sheep of Israel (10:6). This anticipates the 'going' (πορευθέντες aorist participle from πορεύομαι) to make disciples of all the nations (μαθητεύσατε (aorist imperative) πάντα τὰ ἔθνη) in 28:19. The disciples of Jesus are to do the ministry of teaching, preaching, and healing; to do what Jesus did.[111]

Matthew's use of the Synoptic tradition in 9:35-38 is multilayered. He uses and redacts Mark's tradition in a number of ways. With his own introduction to Luke 10:2, he quotes verbatim Q concerning prayer to the Lord of the harvest.

When Matthew 9:35-38 is analyzed in light of the Synoptic tradition, it seems he generally draws from four pre-Matthean sources: three from Mark and one from Q. Matthew draws on Mark's two summary statements in 1:39 and 6:6b. He expands Mark's summary in 1:39—Καὶ ἦλθεν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλων. ('And he went throughout Galilee, proclaiming the message in their synagogues and casting out demons'.) The use of the Markan tradition both supports the summary of Jesus' ministry and anticipates the

[111] On preaching, teaching and the gospel of the kingdom, cf. Luz 1:206-208; Davies and Allison 1:414-16; Nolland (2006) 182-183.

missionary discourse. Matthew changes the aorist indicative active ἦλθεν (from ἔρχομαι) in Mk 1:39 to agree with the imperfect indicative active verb περιῆγεν (from περιάγω) 'went about,' of 6:6b in both 4:23 and in 9:35.

Mark 1:39 Καὶ ἦλθεν **κηρύσσων** εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλων. **Mark 6:6b...Καὶ περιῆγεν** τὰς κώμας κύκλῳ **διδάσκων**.	**Matthew 4:23** Καὶ **περιῆγεν** ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ **διδάσκων** ἐν **ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν καὶ κηρύσσων** τὸ **εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας καὶ θεραπεύων πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν** ἐν τῷ λαῷ.	**Matthew 9:35** Καὶ **περιῆγεν** ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὰς πόλεις πάσας καὶ τὰς κώμας **διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν καὶ κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας καὶ θεραπεύων πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν.**

Second, he draws from Mark 6:6b—Καὶ περιῆγεν τὰς κώμας κύκλῳ διδάσκων. ('Then he went about among the villages teaching').[112] This second summary comes just before the sending out of the twelve in Mark 6:7-13, so also anticipates the missionary discourse in Matthew 10. Again, the highlighted text shows some of the similarities in each telling of the twelve's missionary commissioning.

Mt 10:1 Καὶ **προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς δώδεκα** μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν **αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων** ὥστε ἐκβάλλειν αὐτὰ καὶ θεραπεύειν πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν.	**Mk 6:7** Καὶ **προσκαλεῖται τοὺς δώδεκα** καὶ ἤρξατο αὐτοὺς ἀποστέλλειν δύο δύο καὶ ἐδίδου **αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν ἀκαθάρτων,**

The whole of Mt 9:36, but not without Matthean redaction, is derived from Mark 6:34. In Mark, the phrase 'sheep without a shepherd' (Mk 6:34) is in the context of the feeding of the five thousand. In contrast, Matthew has moved the text and linked the phrase to the overall mission concerning the crowds, specifically to Mt 10:6 and the 'lost sheep of the house of Israel'.

Mt 9:36 ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους **ἐσπλαγχνίσθη** περὶ αὐτῶν, **ὅτι ἦσαν** ἐσκυλμένοι καὶ ἐρριμμένοι **ὡσεὶ πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα.**	**Mk 6:34** Καὶ ἐξελθὼν εἶδεν πολὺν ὄχλον καὶ **ἐσπλαγχνίσθη** ἐπ' αὐτούς, **ὅτι ἦσαν ὡς πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα,** καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς πολλά.

[112] Compare also Lk 4:40-1, 44; 8:1.

Matthew changes the beginning of the verse, leaving out Mark's Καὶ ἐξελθὼν', 'and when he went out'. He replaces the aorist indicative εἶδεν ('he saw') with the aorist participle ἰδὼν ('seeing'). Matthew also adjusts Mark's πολὺν ὄχλον, 'large crowd', to simply τοὺς ὄχλους, 'the crowds'. Matthew likes the plural use of ὄχλος which he uses 30 out of 51 times. The plural simply emphasizes the large response to Jesus.[113] The 'crowds' are to be distinguished from the 'disciple' (μαθητής) or the 'follower' (ἀκολουθέω)—as a disciple—of Jesus.[114] The crowds follow Jesus in great numbers because they are fascinated with him as a charismatic figure. Their reaction to him is normally positive. They respond with: 1) awe filled fear and praise (9:8, ἐφοβήθησαν καὶ ἐδόξασαν τὸν θεὸν), 2) amazement and questions (12:23, ἐξίσταντο πάντες οἱ ὄχλοι) and 3) wonder and astonishment (15:31, ὥστε τὸν ὄχλον θαυμάσαι and 22:22, καὶ ἀκούσαντες ἐθαύμασαν,). But in being drawn to Jesus in this way, they are potential disciples of Jesus. The 'crowds' esteem him as he enters Jerusalem (21:9) and see him as a prophet (21:11, 46). Matthew contrasts the 'crowds', who 'marveled' (ἐθαύμασαν) at his authority over the demonic, with the Pharisees who accuse him of casting out demons by the 'prince of demons' (9:33-34).[115] It is this same crowd that

---

[113] Matthew uses the plural ὄχλοι much more frequently than Mark or Luke, (30,1,13). Matthew uses ὄχλοι πολλοι seven times, again to emphasize the 'great crowds'.

[114] Luz 1:206 blurs the distinction between the crowd and the disciple. 'The crowds and the disciples who follow in vv. 18-22 must not be understood as two circles which have to be completely distinguished; rather Matthew indicates by this method that discipleship will expand into the church.' It would still seem from the textual evidence, in spite of the use of the term ἀκολουθέω at times with the crowds, the crowds are not the same as the disciples. Also, the fact the crowds were the 'harassed and helpless' they are also to be understood as different from the Jewish leadership. It was this abusive leadership that has contributed to their being 'lost', like sheep without a shepherd. 'The crowds fall somewhere in between. This is because they are thought of as being, above all, 'the lost sheep of the house of Israel'. They have not yet found faith in the Messiah, but they are not uniformly opposed to him'. Davies and Allison 1:419.

[115] Davies and Allison 1:419. 'Generalizing from the data cited, the crowds are more than neutral background, more than a Greek chorus. They are presented in a more or less positive light. To be sure, the ὄχλος are not true followers of Jesus; yet they are also not in the same league with Jesus' opponents, the chief priests, the elders, the Pharisees'.

Jesus has compassion on (9:36; 14:14; 15:32—each of the texts uses σπλαγχνίζομαι in relation to Jesus' attitude toward the crowd).

However, there is one negative in regard to Matthew's depiction of the 'crowds': they are associated with Jesus' death. This is illustrated in 26:47, 55—where an ὄχλος πολὺς 'with swords and clubs' come out with Judas and in 27:20, 24 where the chief priests and the elders persuaded the crowds (ἔπεισαν τοὺς ὄχλους) to ask for Barabbus and destroy/kill (ἀπολέσωσιν) Jesus. Even in the two negative cases, the crowd is victimized by the Jewish leadership. Jesus rebukes the Pharisees and scribes in response to their challenge in 15:1-20 and commands his disciples, 'Let them alone, they are blind guides' (ἄφετε αὐτούς· τυφλοί εἰσιν ὁδηγοι). Matthew is not anti-Jewish. He is however opposed to the specific Jewish leadership of his day.[116]

In 9:36, Matthew follows Mark in describing Jesus as compassionate (ἐσπλαγχνίσθη) but adds two perfect passive participles, ἐσκυλμένοι καὶ ἐρριμμένοι, 'harassed and helpless' to describe the crowds. Finally, he omits Mark's final phrase after 'sheep without a shepherd', καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς πολλά ('and he began to teach them many things').

In 9:37-38, Matthew utilizes Q:

Mt 9:37b-38, ὁ μὲν θερισμὸς πολύς, οἱ δὲ Ἐργάται ὀλίγοι· δεήθητε οὖν τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ θερισμοῦ ὅπως ἐκβάλῃ ἐργάτας εἰς τὸν θερισμὸν αὐτοῦ.	**Lk 10:2b,** ὁ μὲν θερισμὸς πολύς, οἱ δὲ Ἐργάται ὀλίγοι· δεήθητε οὖν τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ θερισμοῦ ὅπως ἐργάτας ἐκβάλῃ εἰς τὸν θερισμὸν αὐτοῦ.

This textual analysis has further clarified how Matthew uses his sources, both Mark and Q, and it has illustrated how as a redactor he has shaped the material and used it in light of his own redactional concerns. In the next section we will examine

[116] Saldarini (2001) 166-184.

his use of the biblical tradition regarding an unmarked quote, illustrated in Matthew 9:36.

7.3.2 Intertextual Analysis of Mt 9:36

The metaphor 'sheep without a shepherd' (ὡσ(εὶ) πρόβατα οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν ποιμήν) is used relatively often in the biblical tradition including Num 27:17; I Kgs 22:17//II Chr 18:16; Jdt 11:19.[117] Since Mt 9:36 is 'unmarked', some refer to it as an allusion and thus not counted among the Matthean OT quotations. While brief, enough of the text is there to make it an identifiable quote, though the specific source is arguable. As noted above, Matthew follows Mark 6:34 but removes it from the context of the feeding of the five thousand and places it here, possibly because 'sheep without a shepherd' fits thematically with the mission in 10:6. Whether or not the metaphor had become 'proverbial' and/or conventional, thereby loosing its vitality as a metaphor, is debated. As noted earlier, the metaphor of herds/flocks running wild without a shepherd can be traced back to the time of Ipu-wer.[118] Whatever its origin, Matthew reasserts the metaphor by intertextually associating it with the biblical tradition of Moses and the kings. Now, he revitalizes it by connecting it with the current context concerning Jesus' heart of compassion (ἐσπλαγχνίσθη) for the harassed and helpless (ἐσκυλμένοι καὶ ἐρριμμένοι) multitudes. The metaphor works both directions, referring to the leaderless situation and to Jesus as the shepherd who will fill that void. The quotation may be considered in light of at least two texts from the biblical tradition, Num 27:17 and I Kgs 22:17. The phrase implies a leaderless people and/or an army without a commander or

---

[117] The Hebrew for Num 27:17 and II Chr 18:16 are almost identical:
כְּצֹאן אֲשֶׁר אֵין־לָהֶן רֹעֶה//כַּצֹּאן אֲשֶׁר אֵין־לָהֶם רֹעֶה;
The phrase in I Kg 22:17 is the same as Num 27:17: כַּצֹּאן אֲשֶׁר אֵין־לָהֶם רֹעֶה

[118] Cf. above chapter four on the ANE and the Egyptian examples.

king. Based on 2:6, Matthew asserts that Jesus is the shepherd who will remedy the situation.[119]

> Probably implicit in 9.36 is the notion that Israel is waiting for her true shepherd, Messiah Jesus. The evangelist has already asserted, on the basis of OT texts, that the Messiah will 'shepherd' Israel (2.6), and there is some evidence that 'shepherd' carried messianic connotations in Judaism (Jer 3.15; 23.4; Ezek 34.23-4; 37.24; Ps. Sol.17.40; *Midr. Ps.* On 29.1). Is not Jesus the messianic shepherd, whose responsibility it is to gather eschatological Israel?[120]

As argued below, texts like these inform the Matthean shepherd/sheep metaphor and provide the backdrop to the specific quotes from Numbers and Kings.

7.3.2.1 Num 27:17; I Kgs 22:17//II Chr 18:16; Jdt 11:19

It may be that Matthew uses ὡσει (Mt 9:36) to replace Mark's ὡς (Mk 6:34), in order to make it a bit closer to the LXX Num 27:17. But for whatever reason he chooses to change the first word to ὡσεὶ, while ὡς is his custom, he makes this initial change and then chooses to follow Mark faithfully.[121]

Mk 6:34—ὡς πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα,
Mt 9:36—ὡσεὶ πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα.
Num 27—ὡσεὶ πρόβατα οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν ποιμήν

However, Num 27 is not the only possibility for the quotation. It seems possible that the biblical tradition as a whole (i.e. Num, Kgs//Chr and Jdt and even Zech 10:2) may be intended here to inform Matthew's readers/hearers. In spite of the minor verbal/linguistic differences, there is clear intertextual linkage. This usage by Matthew is emphasized to illustrate the point that this is another of Matthew's literary and intertextual techniques to support his Christology. There are at least four links:

---

[119] Luz 1: 64-65. 'On the basis of 2:6 the most natural assumption is that Matthew is thinking of Jesus himself as a shepherd'.
[120] Davies and Allison 2:148.
[121] Menken (2004) 205-26 argues 'that Matthew's preference for ὡσεὶ is just a question of style (ὡς and ὡσεὶ have the same meaning), that in 3,16, he changed ὡς, which he found in Mark 1,10, into ὡσεὶ, and that in 14,21, he introduced ὡσεὶ in the sense of "about" in Mark 6,44. So there is no compelling reason to assume that in the quotation in 9,36, Matthew created closer agreement with the LXX'.

Num 27:17 → I Kgs 22:17//II Chr 18:16 → Jdt 11:19 → Mk 6:34. Also sometimes included in this 'linkage' is a fifth from Zech 10:2. With intertextual linkage, each of the OT texts shapes the meaning of the Matthean text. In the case of Num 27:17, Moses passes on leadership in order for a new 'exodus' or passage into a new phase of God's activity and leading of the people of God. So also with Jesus, his death and exodus has not yet come to the fore in the narrative of the Gospel. The mission is still focused on the 'lost sheep of the house of Israel'. But, already a new phase is being introduced; the disciples must share in the mission. The mission is too large and too important for Jesus to try to meet the need without involving laborers to help. Jesus' judgment is upon those who are the current shepherds, not because there are not leaders, but because there is an absence of compassionate and righteous leadership. Zechariah 'authorizes' the legitimacy of condemning the unfaithful leadership of his day. He follows in the traditions of Jeremiah 23, 50:6-8 and Ezekiel 34, when he pronounces judgment by his prophecy in 10:2.

Matthew's replacement of ὡσει for Mark's ὡς, whether it is Matthean 'style' or not,[122] does not take away from understanding Matthew's primary focus on the Numbers 27. While Numbers' use of the 'sheep without a shepherd' metaphor may include a military dimension, the broader leadership of Moses is also in view. Also, the three following texts are more explicitly related to the military aspect of army and commander. The first two deal with the prophet Micah's prophecy of judgment over kings Ahab and Jehoshaphat in regard to going to battle at Ramoth-giliad. The Judith text is her positive prophecy concerning Holofernes and his future leadership.

---

[122] While it is acknowledged that he does make the substitution in the cases noted by Menken, at 3:16, here 9:36 and 14:21, it is only on three occasions. Do three uses constitute style? While numbers at times may be helpful, by themselves they do not confirm literary style or intent. While Matthew uses ὡς 3 times, he will use ὡσεὶ over 40 times; Mk ὡς=22, ὡσεὶ=1; Lk ὡς=51, ὡσεὶ=9.

I Kgs 22:17—ὡς ποίμνιον ᾧ οὐκ ἔστιν ποιμήν
II Chr 18:16—ὡς πρόβατα οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν ποιμήν
Jd 11:19—ὡς πρόβατα οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν ποιμήν

The Numbers passage has much to offer as a background text to Matthew 9:36. For example, Moses was a shepherd and was God's deliverer of his people.[123] Matthew has argued on the basis of the biblical tradition in 2:6 that Jesus is the messianic shepherd who will deliver and lead God's people. In Numbers, Moses is passing on leadership and Jesus, in this context, is passing on leadership. Next, Moses was concerned that the people not be left leaderless. Jesus' present concern for the multitude is that there is a lack of leadership and the vacuum must be filled. Finally, in both cases the context is one of prayer. Moses prays in 27:16-17; Jesus commands that prayer be offered in 9:37-38.

> When one also recalls that there are certainly places in Matthew where Jesus is one like Moses and that some Jews no doubt expected the last redeemer (Messiah) to be like the first redeemer (Moses), the reader should perhaps think that Jesus the shepherd is taking up a Mosaic office when he seeks out the lost sheep of the house of Israel.[124]

Further, the Numbers text does not stand alone as a background for 9:36. There are other texts that are relevant to the shepherd/sheep metaphor in this context. Literarily, the Kings/Chronicles passage may illustrate negative leadership among the kings of Israel. Now, this is to be replaced by the true royal shepherd, the Son of David.

7.3.2.2 Jer 3:15, 23:1-6, 50:6; Ez 34:4-6; Zech 10:2

The allusions possible for this Matthew 9:36 are numerous. To begin, Jeremiah 23:1-6 develops an extended metaphor of the shepherd/sheep motif. This includes: (1) Judgment (23:1-2) on the shepherds who 'destroy and scatter the sheep'

---

[123] Ex 3.1; Philo, *Vit. Mos.* 1.60-6: Josephus, *Ant.* 2.263-4.
[124] Davies and Allison 2:147-148.

(διασκορπίζοντες καὶ ἀπολλύοντες τὰ πρόβατα), (2) the promise (23:3-4) that God will raise up 'shepherds' (plural) to shepherd the people of God without 'fear' (φοβηθήσονται) or 'dismay' (πτοηθήσονται) in the authority and attitude of the Lord[125] and (3) the hope of the Davidic Messiah (23:5-6) who 'shall reign as king and deal wisely' (βασιλεύσει βασιλεὺς καὶ συνήσει) executing 'justice and righteousness in the land' (ποιήσει κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς). As in the allusion to Psalm 72 in Matthew 2:11, so the character of righteousness is dominant in regard to this Davidic ruler. His name will be called, 'The Lord is our righteousness.' (τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ὃ καλέσει αὐτὸν κύριος Ιωσεδεκ). In light of these promises Matthew understands that the commissioning of the disciples to carry out Jesus' mission as his under-shepherds is in line with the biblical tradition concerning the promise of God to raise up shepherds along with sending the Shepherd-Messiah.

It might be argued that a similar outline is reflected in Mt 9:36ff. The current leadership is indicted for their oppressive and abusive leadership, evident by the condition of the crowd. Under-shepherds are being raised up. First, they are raised up with the disciples and then, through their ministry, others will follow. For Matthew, Jesus is the Davidic Messiah: 'David a righteous Branch' (Δαυιδ ἀνατολὴν[126] δικαίαν) whose mission it is to gather the lost sheep of Israel.

While the language of Ez 34:4-6 is not verbally the same as the Matthean language of 'harassed and helpless' (ἐσκυλμένοι καὶ ἐρριμμένοι), the imagery is similar. Ezekiel's indictment against the shepherds was ruthless because 'with force and harshness you have ruled them'(καὶ τὸ ἰσχυρὸν κατειργάσασθε μόχθῳ). The result

[125] Previous to this promise Jeremiah has in a much more abbreviated fashion give a similar word: Jer 3:15, here again 'shepherds (plural) after my own heart' (ποιμένας κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου) will be given to 'feed' (ποιμανοῦσιν) the people of God, who include 'all nations' (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη) (3:17) with 'knowledge and understanding' (ποιμαίνοντες μετ' ἐπιστήμης).

[126] Cf. Mt 2:1-2 and the discussion of this term there.

is similar to the time of Jesus: 'they were scattered, because there was no shepherd; and scattered, they became food for all the wild animals' (Ez 34:5). This part of the prophecy emphasizes the judgment upon the current shepherds and the distress of the people. The prophecy continues to describe how God will gather his people and provide a Davidic Messiah for his people. The Ezekiel passage follows in the tradition of Jeremiah recognizing the deep distress of the current situation. Yet, the distress is held in tension with the promise of renewed royal leadership (34:23-24) and a renewed everlasting covenant, characterized by peace (37:24-26). The messianic hope is that God's intervention will renew a sense of the divine presence and ultimately a second deliverer will overcome the current oppression and distress.

In the second part of Zechariah (9-14),[127] Zech 10:2 is the first of a number of references to the shepherd motif. It describes the people as sheep who suffer for lack of shepherd or a healer (οὐκ ἦν ἴασις 'they have no healing'), according to the LXX. Linguistically, the text is only marginally related to the earlier texts. However, it seems sure that it is conceptually related to the earlier texts. If Matthew wanted to use it in light of the healings of Jesus, it would seem that he could have made a closer connection. In light of the question as to its status, it is left open ended.[128]

For Matthew, the leadership of the Judaism of the day had become similar to the evil shepherds of an earlier time. Just as Ezekiel would challenge the leaders of his own day in light of the tragedy of the first destruction of Jerusalem, so Matthew would look around at his own situation and declare that the leadership of Israel had gone bad. Rather than proposing a prophetic hope, he understands Jesus as God's royal-righteous

[127] Fourteen times from 10:2-13:7 but the predominant number of uses are in chapter 11. The metaphor of sheep/shepherd/flock is one of the dominant images of Zech 9-14.
[128] As a note CD XIII.9-10 and *Pss. of Sol.* 17:40 are similar in language and so are in the same biblical frame of thinking but whether Matthew knew of either of these texts is up for debate.

shepherd who will, with compassion, provide leadership to the shepherdless people of God. Initially, Jesus will provide the shepherd-leadership but will then extend it through his under-shepherds (the disciples) who he will raise up and send out to extend his mission (10:5-8).

7.3.3 Contextual Analysis of Mt 9:35-38

In light of Mt 9:36, Jesus is the compassionate shepherd. It might be said that in the infancy narrative and specifically in regard to the shepherd text of 2:6, Matthew presents who Jesus is as shepherd, the royal-righteous shepherd. Now at 9:36, following the teachings and healings of Jesus, Matthew emphasizes his compassion and the extension of his mission through his under-shepherds.

Using the metaphor of the shepherd-less people, Matthew brings together both Mosaic and Davidic motifs to define and inform what kind of shepherd Jesus is. The unmarked quotation from Numbers 27 is the background for Jesus' appointment of the twelve as under-shepherds consistent with the compassionate shepherd Jesus. The Kings passage brought into view the monarchy and the need for ruler-ship that reflects the character of the Lord with His compassion and justice. The intertextual link from Numbers to Kings brings into focus the lack of political leadership and the lack of spiritual guidance.

The fact that the crowd is depicted as 'harassed and helpless' (both passive participles) emphasizes for Matthew that their condition has been inflicted upon them. Like Ez 34:4-5, the Jewish leadership is guilty of abusing the people. This is consistent with Matthew's distinction between evil Jewish leaders and victimized people elsewhere in the Gospel. Matthew sees the Jewish people as sheep, lacking the provision, protection and guidance of a genuine shepherd. The current leadership has moved in the Matthean narrative from being indifferent or passive (2:4-6) to positively

malicious. This theme will continue to become even more acute as the Gospel unfolds. They have become the anti-shepherds in the tradition of Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Zechariah.

Jesus' response to the people's circumstances is not condemnation toward the crowds but compassion and mission. Consistent with prophetic tradition concerning the evil shepherds, while not using shepherd language, Jesus will condemn the current Jewish leadership in Matthew 23. But for the crowds of Israel they are 'lost sheep' 'harassed and helpless' in need of a shepherd(s)/leader(s). For Jesus the mission to the 'lost sheep of Israel' (10:5-6) begins in prayer and is to be carried out through the disciples. Jesus as shepherd has declared the message and teaching of the kingdom (4:23-7:29) and demonstrated the meaning and effects of the kingdom in his ministry of healing and deliverance (8:1-9:35). The missionary work of the disciples is introduced by describing the missionary work of Jesus. The summary of Jesus ministry (4:17-25) now becomes a summary of the disciples' ministry (10:7-8a). The disciples are to see the 'lost sheep of Israel' as Jesus sees them, 'with compassion'. They are also to do what Jesus did; bring the message and ministry of the kingdom. By this, the disciples, as a result of Jesus' commissioning, become also shepherd-healers and teachers.[129] Matthew pushes the shepherd metaphor to encompass as much as possible. I think on the basis of Matthew's Christology it is appropriate to associate the shepherd metaphor with healing and teaching, even though it may be argued that it is not central. Matthew understands Jesus to be a miracle-worker and healer and also the teacher and preacher of the kingdom and gives that same authority to his disciples (10:1, 5-8).

[129] Moss (2002) 51ff; 68ff; Ham (2005) 117, n 54.

7.3.4 Metaphor Analysis of Mt 9:36

Matthew says that when Jesus saw the crowds, he had compassion for them 'because' (ὅτι) they were harassed and helpless. The metaphor used of the crowds is:

'like sheep without a shepherd'
ὡσεὶ πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα.

The *tenor/topic* is the 'crowds' and the *vehicle* is 'shepherd-less sheep'. The combination of these two together make up the *focus* of the metaphor. The context *frame* indicates that the metaphor is aimed at a lack of positive leadership. Further, Matthew's use of 'harassed and helpless' also implies that the leadership is abusive.[130]

The context *frame* in Matthew implies Jesus is the compassionate shepherd, particularly in view of his relation to the crowd.[131] It illustrates how an *interanimation/perspectival* theory of metaphor is helpful in appreciating not only the *focus* of the metaphor but also how the interaction of thoughts and words are active together to imply that Jesus is the compassionate shepherd, even though the text does not explicitly state it. The thought emerges in light of the specific metaphor of 'sheep without a shepherd'.[132] Here is a case where the *interanimation/perspectival* approach is especially helpful. In order to understand this metaphor the utterance must have a context *frame*. Without a context *frame* it is impossible to know if the meaning of 'sheep without a shepherd' is a literal reference to sheep that are without the oversight of a shepherd or if 'sheep without a shepherd' should be taken metaphorically to refer to people who are leaderless.

Matthew's use of the biblical tradition will again extend and inform the meaning of the shepherd metaphor concerning the shepherd-less crowds and Jesus as

---

[130] Cf. 7.3.1 above for Mt's use of 'the crowds' (οἱ ὄχλοι) and the two perf. pass. part. 'harassed and helpless'.
[131] Cf. 7.3.3 above.
[132] Cf. 7.3.2 above.

the compassionate shepherd. As 'sheep without a shepherd' the biblical tradition speaks of the people being without leadership (e.g. Ez 34:4-6; Zech 10:2). The image was used in regard to kings in times of a crisis in leadership (I Kings 22). The image originates, at least in the biblical tradition, in the Moses story in Numbers 27.[133] The metaphor not only connects Jesus with the Moses tradition but also with the prophetic tradition that promises that God will not only raise up a shepherd messiah but also 'shepherds after my own heart' (Jer 3:15, 23:4). The metaphor establishes the need for a compassionate shepherd and the need for under-shepherds that will embody the qualities of the Shepherd-Messiah.

The metaphor is used by Matthew to depict the crowds as leaderless and therefore in need of leader(s). Jesus as the compassionate Shepherd-Messiah has shown them authoritative teaching (Mt 7:28-29) and healing (Mt 8-9). Now, as the compassionate one, Jesus extends that authoritative teaching and healing through his 'under-shepherds', the disciples, in Matthew 10:1, 6-8. So, the metaphor depicts Jesus as filling the leadership vacuum in his own ministry and extends that 'authority' to the disciples to further the work of the kingdom.

7.4 Introduction and Structure of Mt 15:21-28

First, this text is different from the other Matthean shepherd texts considered in this chapter. The primary difference is that it does not use the noun (ποιμήν) or the verb (ποιμαίνω) in regard to Jesus. Also, there is no direct biblical quote as part of the text, though some potential allusions will be discussed in regard to 15:24. Yet, it is considered because it is similar to 9:36 where Jesus repeats his mission, 'I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel'. He implies that he is the shepherd of the lost sheep.

[133] Cf. 7.3.2.1 above and for similar possible use of the image in the ANE cf. 4.1.3 above.

This text, like 8:5-13, shows Jesus accomplishing a healing from a distance on behalf of a Gentile in response to exceptional faith.[134] For Matthew the christological statement about Jesus' capacity to heal, from a distance with a word, is not the primary focus. For him, the focus falls on two Gentiles who not only exercise faith but who demonstrate exceptional faith. This impressive faith is contrasted with the general lack of faith of the children of Israel. Jesus' relationship with the Gentiles and his stated mission that he 'was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel' will be discussed below (cf. 10:5-6). The miracle story ends up being a dialogue between Jesus and the woman with the climax focusing on the woman's faith rather than the actual healing of the daughter. After a brief introduction and transition (15:21) there is the extended interchange between the woman and Jesus (15:22-27) and then a conclusion (15:28). The flow of the dialogue might be outlined thus:[135]

1) Introduction: transition to present pericope (v21)
  2) The woman's appeal: ἐλέησόν με, κύριε... (v22)
    3) Jesus' initial silence: ὁ δὲ οὐκ ἀπεκρίθη (v23a)
      4) The disciples' complaint: ἀπόλυσον αὐτήν, ὅτι κράζει ὄπισθεν ἡμῶν. (v23b)
        5) Jesus' mission stated: ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς...(v24)
        6) The woman's determination: ἡ δε...κύριε, βοήθει μοι. (v25)
      7) The objection of Jesus: ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς (v26)
    8) The woman's assertive reply: ἡ δὲ εἶπεν· ναὶ κύριε, (v27)
  9) Jesus esteems of her faith: τότε ἀποκριθεὶς...ὦ γύναι, μεγάλη σου ἡ πίστις· (v28a)
10) Conclusion: Jesus grants her request: γενηθήτω σοι ὡς θέλεις. (v28b)

The rhythm and repetition within the pericope reflects Matthew's literary touch. The woman speaks three times (15: 22, 25, 27); Jesus speaks three times (15: 24 ,26 ,28) with the parenthetical protest of the disciples (15:23b). Again, the dialogue focuses on

---

[134] 8:10, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, παρ' οὐδενὶ τοσαύτην πίστιν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ εὗρον. 'Truly I tell you, in no one in Israel have I found such faith.'; 15:28, ὦ γύναι, μεγάλη σου ἡ πίστις· 'O woman, great is your faith!'

[135] This outline is an adaptation from Hagner 2:441. Davies and Allison 2:541, divide the pericope in a similar fashion, 'setting (vv21-22a), extended conversation (vv22b-28c), conclusion (v28d).'

the woman's faith. Matthew has an alternate use of ὁ δε/ἡ δε throughout the dialogue as personal pronouns. Matthew's fourfold response of Jesus includes Jesus' use of ἀποκρίνομαι. Three of the responses are preceded by ὁ δε and the final response is climaxed with τότε; with the woman's threefold use of κύριε in each of her appeals to Jesus and her twofold cry for 'mercy' and 'help' before her final assertive reply. Throughout, Matthew portrays this γυνὴ Χαναναία, 'Canaanite woman' as recognizing the status of Israel even though she is a Gentile. For example, her use of υἱὸς Δαυίδ as a messianic title, similar to the blind men in 9:27 and 20:30-31.[136] Second, Matthew's addition of ναὶ, emphasizes her agreement with Jesus and she extends his metaphor of the 'children's bread' and the 'dogs'. Third, the Matthean addition of γὰρ to καὶ γὰρ, 'and yet' also strengthens her response and the extension of Jesus' metaphor in 15:27.[137]

Structurally, there are a number of interesting comparisons between this pericope and the story of the centurion in Mt 8:5-13.[138] 1) Both are stories of Jesus being engaged by a Gentile (a military man and a Canaanite woman). 2) Both take the initiative with Jesus and request his help. 3) Both are seeking help for a child: the woman for her daughter and the centurion for his servant. Or possibly the help is for the centurion's son rather than his servant (8:6, ὁ παῖς). If this is the case, then the parallelism is even stronger. 4) Both children are in serious distress because of their ailment; the daughter (κακῶς δαιμονίζεται) and the servant/son (δεινῶς

---

[136] An important messianic and christological motif for Matthew (Mt 9, Mk 3, Lk 4): cf. Mt 1:1; 9:27; 12:23; 15:22; 20:30-31; 21:9, 15; 22:42. Cf. e.g. Luz 2:59-61, Hagner 1:253 and Nolan (1980) 158-169; *pace* Davies and Allison 2:135-136 and 548 who argue that, while 'Son of David' is a messianic title (e.g. 1:1), Matthew is making a connection between Jesus and Solomon in this passage (and in 9:27; 12:23; 20:30-31), who was understood as a healer, exorcist, and magician in late Jewish tradition.
[137] Nolland (2005) 635. [Γὰρ], 'following a linking καὶ ('and'),... introduces what is to be seen as an implication drawn out from what has been affirmed ('to be sure, and [precisely because it is so]').'
[138] Cf. Hagner 2:440; Davies and Allison 2:558.

βασανιζόμενος). 5) In both, Jesus is addressed as Lord. 6) Jesus' initial response to the request is reluctance; this is especially so if Jesus' response in 8:7 is understood as a question. 7) Both demonstrate persistence in their request. 8) The actual healing in both accounts is secondary, with Jesus praising both Gentiles for their faith (8:10; 15:28). 9) In both stories, the demonstration of faith on the part of these Gentiles is put in the context of Israel's special status: a) in 15:24 (26) Jesus' unique mission to Israel is emphasized plus b) Israel's failure to respond (8:10-12). 10) Finally, there are linguistic similarities in both of Jesus' final responses made to the two Gentiles as he grants their requests.

Mt 8:13b— ὡς ἐπίστευσας γενηθήτω σοι. καὶ ἰάθη ὁ παῖς [αὐτοῦ] ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐκείνῃ.
Mt 15:28b—γενηθήτω σοι ὡς θέλεις. καὶ ἰάθη ἡ θυγάτηρ αὐτῆς ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης.

One final observation indicates that these two stories are the only two occasions in the Gospel of Matthew that Jesus directly ministers to a Gentile. Both situations cause Matthew to emphasize that, as Gentiles, it is their faith and nothing else that brings about their salvation. Yet, they are set in the context of and in tension with Jesus' primary mission to Israel and Israel's special status (cf. 10:6). While the priority is always upon Israel, the two stories function proleptically in regard to the Gentile mission which will be commanded by Jesus after the resurrection (28:18-20).

7.4.1 Textual Analysis of Mt 15:24

This pericope, not found in Luke, is based upon the earlier material from Mark 7:24-30. But, as is his custom, Matthew shapes the material for his own purposes. The Matthean redaction is 'extraordinarily heavy.'[139] Among the many changes, there are two major ways that Matthew modifies the episode. First, he introduces direct

[139] Luz 2:336, notes some thirty to thirty-five ways Matthew has rewritten Mark and used his own words, phrases or constructions to shape the passage.

dialogue between the woman and Jesus early on. From 15:22 to the end of the pericope, Jesus and the woman are in conversation. Jesus is initially unresponsive to the woman's appeal, which is irritating to the disciples who want him to simply send her away. Second, Matthew's Jesus declares that his mission is only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. This is linguistically almost identical with 10:6. Yet, the woman is not intimidated. Thus, she is one of the few people in the Gospel to persuade Jesus to do something he does not initially appear to want to do.

In many ways, Matthew rewrites the story. Notice how Matthew's redaction of Mark displays Matthew's intentions. As is typical, Matthew uses his own transitional vocabulary in v 21 and then adds καὶ Σιδῶνος 'and Sidon,' to Mark's single Τύρου, 'Tyre'.[140]

Mt 15:21—Καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἐκεῖθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς τὰ μέρη Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος.
Mk 7:24—Ἐκεῖθεν δὲ ἀναστὰς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὰ ὅρια Τύρου.

Matthew leaves out completely Mark 24b and the reference to entering a house and introduces the woman with his characteristic ἰδού[141] (Mt 62; Mk 7; Lk 57) as a Χαναναία, 'Canaanite', changing Mk's Ἑλληνίς, Συροφοινίκισσα τῷ γένει· 'a Greek, Syrophoenician by race' (Mk 7:26). After introducing her, Matthew shows her making her request: λέησόν με, κύριε υἱὸς Δαυίδ· 'Have mercy on me, Lord, Son of David' (v 22). The dialogue has begun. 3) Matthew redefines the need of the daughter to ἡ θυγάτηρ μου κακῶς δαιμονίζεται 'my daughter is tormented by a demon.' (v 22), changing Mark's description of an πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον, 'unclean spirit'. 4) Matthew uses one of his favorite terms in regard to Gentile response.[142] When the woman

---

[140] Matthew always has the two names together, e.g. 11:21-22.
[141] BDAG: ἰδού: a demonstrative or presentative particle that draws attention to what follows; prompter of attention, *behold, look, see.*
[142] προσεκυνέω: recall Mt 2:2, 11.

comes to Jesus, she προσεκύνει αὐτω 'began to worship him' (15: 25). 5) Again, the dialogue is direct, and the woman requests, κύριε, βοήθει μοι, 'Lord, help me' (v 25) contrasted with Mark's third-person request that the demon be banished προσέπεσεν πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ· (Mk 7:25). 6) Mark's παιδίων, 'children', is changed to κυρίων 'masters' by Matthew (v 27) and he totally omits Mark's ἄφες πρῶτον χορτασθῆναι τὰ τέκνα 'allow the children to be fed first' (Mk 7:21). This, Matthew chooses to for economy. 7) Mark's διὰ τοῦτον τὸν λόγον ὕπαγε, ἐξελήλυθεν ἐκ τῆς θυγατρός σου τὸ δαιμόνιον, 'on account of this word, go; the demon has departed from your daughter' (Mk 7:29) is replaced with Matthew's culmination of the pericope with, ὦ γύναι, μεγάλη σου ἡ πίστις· γενηθήτω σοι ὡς θέλεις, 'Woman, great is your faith! Let it be done for you as you wish'. (v 28). In order to emphasize the woman's faith, Matthew abbreviates Mark's conclusion to a considerable degree. He does not mention the woman going home and finding her daughter well (Mk 7:30). 8) It is also noteworthy that Matthew's concluding verse (15: 28) is very much like 8:13. In these eight ways, Matthew both expands and abbreviates Mark according to his own intensions and reformulates the story to emphasize the focus of Jesus' mission to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Yet, at the same time, he recognizes the faith of a Gentile.

7.4.2 Intertextual Analysis of Mt 15:24

Within the Gospel, several verses relate to 15:24 including 10:6, 9:36 and 18:12. In the biblical tradition, Jeremiah 50:6 and Ezekiel 24:23-25 (cf. also Psalm 119:176; Isaiah 53:6) could possibly be in the background of this pericope. Along with these texts, the metaphor of Israel as 'lost sheep' in the biblical tradition is alluded to or implied in Num 27:17, I Kgs 22:17, II Chron 18:16, Ez 34:5; Zech 13:7. Often the

tradition uses the image of the sheep being 'scattered' which implies they are without protection and guidance. The image of 'lostness' is more related to the lack of the shepherd than the fault of the sheep.

7.4.2.1 Jer 50:6 (cf. Isa 53:6;Ez 34)

Matthew's repetition of the mission phrase from 10:6 in the context of the Gentile woman continues the tension in the story concerning the woman's request and Jesus' initial refusal. Intertextually the image of the 'lost sheep' comes potentially from Jeremiah 50:6 which alludes to the specific theme of the people as 'lost sheep'. Again, it is the 'shepherds' (ποιμένες: pl) who have led the people astray. The leadership is identified as the source of the people's 'lostness'.

Mt 10:6 πορεύεσθε δὲ μᾶλλον πρὸς **τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραήλ.**
Mt 15:24 οὐκ ἀπεστάλην εἰ μὴ εἰς **τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραήλ.**
Jer 50:6 (LXX-27:6) **πρόβατα ἀπολωλότα** ἐγενήθη ὁ λαός μου οἱ ποιμένες αὐτῶν ἐξῶσαν

Through the use of the dialogue between the woman and Jesus, Matthew is able to emphasize the woman's address to Jesus as 'son of David'. This introduces another possible reference to the biblical tradition (Ezekiel 34:23-24). It is Ezekiel's prophecy that declares the Lord will 'set up over them' one shepherd, who will be 'my servant David' and he 'shall be prince among them'. Matthew reasserts that Jesus is the royal shepherd in the lineage of David. The Davidic messianic tradition that followed the promises made in II Samuel 7, had been firmly established in the biblical tradition and Matthew continues to return to it again and again in his Gospel, thereby emphasizing Jesus status as David's Messiah, Shepherd of Israel.[143]

[143] Cf. I Chr 17:11, 14; Isa 9:6-7; 11:1; Jer 23:5, 30:9; Ez 34:23-24; 37:24-25; Hos 3:5; Dan 9:25-26.

7.4.3 Contextual Analysis of Mt 15:21-28

Without using the ποιμήν , in this text, Matthew nevertheless introduces another dimension of the shepherding motif. The cry of the Canaanite woman, 'Have mercy on me, Lord, Son of David', λέησόν με, κύριε υἱὸς Δαυίδ· (15: 22), appeals for mercy.[144] The initial reluctance by Jesus to respond heightens the narrative tension and puts more focus on Jesus' mercy toward the woman. Jesus, along with the continuing emphasis on the 'lost sheep of the house of Israel' and being royal shepherd, the Son of David, is shown to be the 'merciful' shepherd. He feels compassion for his people (9:36), but he demonstrates mercy toward the Gentiles. This is a Matthean favorite (ἐλεέω: Mt 9, Mk 3, Lk 4).[145]

While Gentiles are introduced into the Gospel early in the magi story (2:1-11), Jesus takes the initiative to help a Gentile in only two occurrences in the Gospel: here (Mt 15:21-28) and in the healing of the centurion's servant (Mt 8:5-13). The number of similarities between 8:5-13 and 15:21-28 reflects Matthew's literary style in regard to repetitions and parallelisms. The similarities between the two episodes were compared above. Two themes that emerge are: 1) the faith of the two Gentiles in the stories and 2) the importance and priority of Israel in terms of Jesus' ministry.

These two accounts emphasize the faith of the Gentiles and that it is their faith that accomplishes their petition. Jesus' response to their faith is also unique in the Gospel:

8:10—ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, παρ' οὐδενὶ τοσαύτην πίστιν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ εὗρον.
15:28—ὦ γύναι, μεγάλη σου ἡ πίστις·

---

[144]Cf. The cry of the blind men in 9:27; 20:30, 31.

[145] Matthew legitimizes and lends authority to the theme of mercy (ἐλεέω) by appealing twice to the biblical tradition, by marked-quotes 'Go and learn…' and 'if you had known what this means' from Hos 6:6 in 9:13 and 12:7. The other references include the beatitude, 5:7; another cry for mercy, 17:15; the exhortation to those who receive mercy should show mercy, 18:33.

Jesus is not impressed by the faith of any, except these two Gentiles in the whole of Matthew's Gospel. Is this a subtle indictment against Matthew's intended Jewish audience and their lack of response to Jesus as Messiah? Relevant to the textual observations is the fact that this response in 15:28 is not in Matthew's source(s), so it is likely from Matthew's own hand.

Second, Matthew states Jesus' mission clearly in 10:5 and then again here in the narrative at 15:24. Even in the extension of Jesus' mercy to the Gentiles, Matthew is careful to show that Israel's priority is not lost. The main concern of the mission is to the 'lost sheep of the house of Israel' (10:6; 15:24). But, the royal shepherd of Israel is also the merciful shepherd of the Gentiles. Matthew is not uncomfortable with the tension, for him it is the historical reality of the ministry of Jesus and the reality of his present situation in which the Gentiles are responding to the message of the Gospel and his own kinsmen are not. When faith is demonstrated by the Gentiles, they will also be included into the people of God. In this way, Matthew proleptically anticipates the Gentile mission in 28:18-20.[146] At the same time he argues for Jesus' mission and priority to his own people the Jews. There is a sense in which this tension may have also been felt by Matthew in his own historical situation.

In light of this largeness of mercy, Matthew also presented Jesus the shepherd as the judge exercising his justice at the eschatological end. To that, we will turn next.

7.4.4 Metaphor Analysis of Mt 15:24

The metaphor analysis will specifically consider the phrase:

'I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel'.
οὐκ ἀπεστάλην εἰ μὴ εἰς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραήλ.

[146] Davis and Allison 2:558-559.

The *tenor/topic* is the 'house of Israel', and the *vehicle* is 'the lost sheep'. While the shepherd metaphor is not stated explicitly it is implied in the 'lost sheep' image. In order to generate this metaphor the *focus* is the *interanimation* of *tenor/topic* and the *vehicle*. The *frame* shows the Canaanite woman in relation to Jesus as shepherd, while the metaphor emphasizes his mission to 'the lost sheep of the house in Israel'.

In the Matthean context, the *frame* highlights the seriousness of the condition of the house of Israel, particularly as it is contrasted to the faith of a Gentile woman. The metaphor serves to emphasize Matthew's focus on the Gentile's response to Jesus. This theme of response began in the story of the magi who respond positively to the new born king, even with gifts and worship (προσκυνέω). Then again in the story of the centurion in Matthew 8:5-13, the centurion demonstrates great faith. The Canaanite woman's story parallels the centurion story, in which these Gentile believers express the kind of faith Matthew's Jesus yearns to see among 'the lost sheep of the house of Israel'. In each case they are granted their requests.[147] This *frame* therefore connects the metaphor of 'the lost sheep of the house of Israel' with the people of God and their lack of belief in Jesus and heightens the seriousness of Israel's 'lostness'. The narrative *frame* continues this contrast between the woman's faith and the children of Israel's lack of it through the way the woman addresses Jesus, first with 'O Lord, Son of David' (15:22) and then twice again as 'Lord' (15:25, 27) as she knelt (προσκυνέω) before him. The woman is portrayed as the faithful one who accepts the true identity of Jesus, while the house of Israel remains lost.[148]

---

[147] Cf. 7.4 above.
[148] Cf. 7.4.1 above.

The intertextual influences are not as strong in this pericope, though Jeremiah 50:6 relates to the metaphor specifically, 'My people have been lost sheep; their shepherds have led them astray'. Other texts might be cited[149] but as noted above, the strength of the pericope is the contrast of the Gentile woman and 'the lost sheep of the house of Israel'. The narrative *frame* between the Gentile woman whose faith is expressed and whose 'desire' (θέλω) is granted is contrasted with the 'lostness' of Israel, who remains in ignorant unbelief and whose collective yearnings remain unfulfilled, because they do not recognize the royal shepherd, the Son of David. For Matthew the mission of Jesus was first to 'the house of Israel' and therefore he depicts Jesus as the royal shepherd, the Son of David (Ez 34:23-24). Matthew could only hope that the kind of faith expressed by the Canaanite women would be expressed by Israel in regard to Jesus the royal shepherd.

7.5 Introduction and Structure of Mt 25:31-46

This passage is unique to Matthew and probably comes from his special source (M).[150] In the overall scheme of the Gospel, the pericope functions in two ways: 1) it brings to conclusion the end of the immediate context which has been the eschatological discourse of 24:1-25:46. As the scene of the final judgment, it logically fits here in the final block of teaching. What kind of text is it? This is not a trial but is a sentencing. It is a judgment scene, pure and simple, where the Son of Man comes and executes judgment (v 31). In spite of the fact that it is often referred to as a parable, it is actually the description of a real, though future, event--the last judgment.

---

[149] Cf. 7.4.2 and 7.4.2.1 above

[150] Hagner 2:740. 'The only partial parallels are to its opening and close. Thus Mark 8:38b and Luke 9:26b both refer to the coming of the Son of Man in glory (Mark: of his Father; Luke: his and his Father's) with his holy angels'. Yet, there are a number of unique vocabulary and unparalleled expressions: e.g. 'the kingdom from the foundation of the world' (v 34); 'one of the least of these my brothers' (v 40); 'the devil and his angels' (v 41); 'eternal punishment' (v 46). These elements point to the fact that while Matthew engages in his typical redaction he also has a special source from the tradition. Cf. Davis and Allison 3:417-418.

It is not a parable, but a 'word picture for the final judgment'.[151] 2) It functions to bring to conclusion the formal teaching of Jesus that Matthew has gathered in the five large blocks of teaching throughout the Gospel.[152]

Matthew uses his standard phrase to conclude this section of teaching in 26:1, Καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς πάντας τοὺς λόγους τούτους... Matthew does not add any commentary to the scene. He adds neither exhortation nor appeal. The pericope speaks for itself. Here again, Matthew shows his literary skill. The last judgment scene is strategically placed prior to the passion narrative. As the story turns to describe the 'smitten shepherd' (26:31) and one who will be led to the slaughter, the reader/hearer is reminded in the present pericope that Jesus will have the final word in regard to humanity's eternal destiny (25:45-46).

Within the passage itself, Matthew again capitalizes on his literary techniques to accomplish his task. Some of the primary features of the pericope are Matthew's use of symmetry, repetition and parallelisms with internal cross-referencing to other parts of the Gospel.

The following outline attempts to appreciate the symmetry of the passage by allowing the repetitions and parallelisms to shape the whole.[153]

Introduction: The Son of Man comes in his glory (v 31);

1) The initial great separation (vv 32-33);
    2) The reward of the righteous (34-40) subdivided into:
        (a) the inheritance (v 34), (b) the explanation (vv 35-36),
        (c) the questions (vv 37-39), (d) the justification (v 40);
    3) The judgment of the wicked (41-45) subdivided into:
        (a) the judgment (41), (b) the explanation (vv 42-43),
        (c) the question(v 44), and (d) the justification (v 45)
4) The final great separation (v 46).

---

[151] Davies and Allison 3:418.
[152] Stanton (1992) 210.
[153] Hagner 2:740. This is an adaptation of Hagner's structure and he notes it is constructed like this 'perhaps for ease in memorization'.

One of the main aspects of the repetitions is the list of six needs expressed four times throughout the pericope. The list of needs is always the same: hungry, thirsty, a stranger, naked, sick and in prison. The list is then followed by three questions by the blessed (οἱ εὐλογημένοι, v 34) and one by the cursed ([οἱ] κατηραμένοι, v 41). The questions by the blessed are consistently introduced by πότε σε εἴδομεν, 'when did we see you?' Then, Jesus gives the justification for the judgment (vv 40, 45). Another repetition is worthy of noting, the solemn statement in the declaration of the justifications in verses 40 and 45: ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν.

This whole structure is focused on the process of separation (ἀφορίσει) of sheep from the goats by the shepherd. Linguistically, this separation (ἀφορίσει) echoes Matthew 13:49 where at the end of the age the angels separate the evil from the righteous. Another echo in regard to 25:31 is 13:41 where it is the Son of Man who exercises judgment through his angels. A close parallel to Matthew 25:31 comes from 16:27, which refers to the coming of the Son of Man. Significant in regard to Matthew's Christology is the difference noted between 16:27 where it is ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς, 'in the glory of his Father' and here in 25:31 where the Son of Man comes ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ, 'in his glory'. The two appear to be synonymous for Matthew.

> That Matthew can alter this language so naturally is an indicator of his high Christology. The remainder of 16:27 'then he will repay everyone for what has been done', is, of course, the point of the present scene concerning the sheep and the goats.[154]

Finally, earlier in the eschatological discourse the Son of Man comes in glory and the angels come with him to gather the elect and exercise judgment (24:30-31). Matthew creates this internal cross referencing by echoing similar language in order to

[154] Hagner 2:741.

call to mind the related materials.[155] Other internal cross references could include: 25:40 (ἑνὶ τούτων τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν ἐλαχίστων) with 25:45 (ἑνὶ τούτων τῶν ἐλαχίστων[156]) and with 10:40-42 (ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων). It could also include 19:28; 24:9 (πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν), v 14 (πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν), and v 30 (πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς) with 25:32 and πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. These will be discussed briefly below.

7.5.1 Textual Analysis of Mt 25:32

The focus in this textual analysis will be primarily Matthew 25:32 as the specific shepherd text. Also, to be discussed are the two phrases τὰ ἔθνη from 25:32 and 'the least of these' (τούτων τῶν ἐλαχίστων) from 25:40, 45.

Matthew now associates the shepherd metaphor with the Son of Man (v 31) in order to connect the image with one of the primary eschatological themes of the Gospel. The Son of Man takes up the role of eschatological judge which is normally the role of God alone. Matthew then employs the shepherd metaphor to depict the judgment of πάντα τὰ ἔθνη and the separating of the sheep from the goats. The metaphor is apparently drawn from the image of the shepherd who at the end of the day separates the flock. The goats are separated from sheep for the purposes of warmth and safety.

Whatever Matthew's intention about the ultimate status of Jesus, he now associates him with this exalted role of the Davidic shepherd who will rule beside God (Dan 7:13-14). 'The background to these verses and to this verse, 25:31 is Dan 7:13-14. Jesus as the Son of Man functions as judge—a role restricted to Yahweh in the OT.'[157]

---

[155] Nolland (2005) 1024.
[156] BDAG: ἐλάχιστος, ίστη, ον used as superlative of μικρός: *smallest, least.* Usually reduced in degree *very small, quite unimportant, insignificant* Mt 2:6; *least important, of little importance* Mt 25:40, 45.
[157] Hagner 2:742.

Mt 25:32 All the nations will be gathered before him, and he will separate people one from another as a shepherd separates the sheep from the goats, **33** and he will put the sheep at his right hand and the goats at the left.	**Mt 25:32** καὶ συναχθήσονται ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, καὶ ἀφορίσει αὐτοὺς ἀπ' ἀλλήλων, ὥσπερ ὁ ποιμὴν ἀφορίζει τὰ πρόβατα ἀπὸ τῶν ἐρίφων,**33** καὶ στήσει τὰ μὲν πρόβατα ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ, τὰ δὲ ἐρίφια ἐξ εὐωνύμων.

The 'nub of the exegetical dispute' in regard to this passage is described fairly succinctly by G. N. Stanton:

> Is this pericope concerned with the attitude of the world in general to the needy (the 'universalist' interpretation), or is it, rather, the world's attitude to the church which is in view (the 'particularist' interpretation)?[158]

On the basis of Matthean internal cross references alluded to above, the position of the thesis is more that of the 'particularist' position rather than that of the 'universalist' position. It would seem that in Matthew 24:30 (πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς) when he speaks of 'all the tribes of the earth', he is referring to all non-Christian peoples. Along with this, there is no indication that when Matthew speaks of τὰ ἔθνη that he uses the term to refer to Christians. Instead, it always refers to Gentiles in contrast to Jews and Christians.[159] This is also the case earlier in the eschatological discourse. Mt 24:9 (πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν) and v 14 (πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν) both must refer to non-Christians. So, when 25:32 (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη) is compared with these three internal cross references, and other uses of τὰ ἔθνη (cf. 28:18-20), it does not refer to Christians or Jews but to non-Christian Gentiles.[160] To make this claim concerning Matthew is to attempt to understand the way Matthew understands the teaching of

---

[158] Stanton (1992) 209. Cf. Gray (1989) 9.

[159] Mt 15; Mk 6; Lk 13. ἔθνος, ους, τό—1. *nation, people* Mt 24:14;...τὰ ἔθνη *Gentiles, non-Jews* as contrasted with Jews Mt 6:32, etc. Cf. Mt 4:15; 6:32; 10:5, 18; 12:18, 21; 20:19, 25; 21:43; 24:7 (2 times), 9, 14; 25:32; 28:19.

[160] Stanton (1992) 214. It is interesting that Matthew the 'Jewish' Gospel references more to the Gentiles than either of the other Synoptics. Cf. Mt 4:15; 6:32; 10:5, 18; 12:18, 21; 20:19, 25; 21:43; 24:7 (2 times), 9, 14; 25:32; 28:19.

Jesus and his understanding of the socio-historical setting of the first recipients. It is not intended to relativize the truth of the NT concerning the marginalized or poor in society. In a canonical perspective, other parts of the NT speak to this. For Matthew 'the non-Christian nations are to be judged by the Son of Man on the basis of actions they have done (or not done) to the followers of Jesus'.[161]

Equally controversial are the phrases in 25:40, 45 'one of the least of these my brothers' (ἑνὶ τούτων τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν ἐλαχίστων), and 'one of the least of these' (ἑνὶ τούτων τῶν ἐλαχίστων). This is generally understood in one of four ways:[162]

1) Everyone, i.e., particularly the needy among humankind
2) All Christians
3) Christian missionaries (or a group among Christians described as 'lowliest brothers')[163]
4) Jewish Christians

Number four is usually understood as interpreting the word 'brothers' too narrowly. The differences between two and three is said to be too eccentric because all Christians are to engage in witness (cf. 10:32).[164] So, the preferred option is between one and two; or to use Stanton's categories, the 'universalist' or 'particularist' interpretations.[165]

Again to investigate Matthew's possible intertextual cross references, ἐλαχίστος 'least' is only used one other time in the Gospel in 5:19, and that is a negative use. The general agreement is that the parallel image for Matthew is οἱ

---

[161] Stanton (1992) 210-211 & 218.
[162] Hagner 2:742 summarizes Gray (1989) 255-257, whose survey of nuanced options gives approx. 32 options. The scholars and their works are then categorized on 257-272.
[163] E.g. Luz 3:280ff, approaches the question in this way.
[164] Cf. Stanton (1992) 214-218 and Hagner 2:744-45, for a full discussion and agreement with the position taken here. *Pace* Davies and Allison 3:428-430 for the 'universalist' interpretation. Luz 3:279-282, also seems to take a 'particularist' interpretation when he says, 'for Matthew the "lowliest" [brothers] are mixed in with the others' [i.e. the whole Christian community not a special group among Christians] 282.
[165] Stanton (1992) 208-209.

μικροί, 'the little ones'. Also, when it is taken into account that ἐλαχίστος is the superlative of μικροί then there is internal help from the Gospel in interpreting the phrase.[166] οἱ μικροι occurs in reference to the disciples generally in Matthew 18:6 and functions as an *inclusio* in the parable of the lost sheep in vv 10 and 14.[167]

But, probably most helpful is the comparison between 25:40 (ἑνὶ τούτων τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν ἐλαχίστων), and 45 (ἑνὶ τούτων τῶν ἐλαχίστων) with 10:40-42 (ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων). Not only is there a verbal link but the content is also parallel. In the missionary discourse Jesus identifies the two as closely as is possible, 'He who receives you receives me'. This is parallel to the phrase 'when you have done it to "one of the least of these" you have done it unto me'. Then 10:42 further emphasizes that the simplest of kindness done to a follower of Jesus shall be rewarded. The phrase 'I was thirsty and you gave me to drink' (ἐδίψησα καὶ ἐποτίσατέ με, 25:35) is paralleled with the 'cup of cold water' (ποτίσῃ, 10:42). Finally, the ὁι ἀδελφοί in Matthew is used consistently of Christian disciples (cf. 12:48-49; 28:10; cf. also 28:8). 'Matthew uses οἱ ἀδελφοί 18 times to refer to a fellow member of the Christian family; no fewer than 12 of the 18 are redactional'.[168]

The arguments for the 'particularist' interpretation seem to be most internally consistent with the Gospel. This position is understood as relating to the socio-historical setting of Matthew's Gospel specifically. For Matthew the way the world, those non-believing persons, treats the Christian community is the way the world is treating Jesus. To receive the message of the kingdom or to have extended the slightest

---

[166] BDAG:ἐλάχιστος, ίστη, ον used as superlative of μικρός: *smallest, least*. Usually reduced in degree *very small, quite unimportant, insignificant* Mt 2:6; *least important, of little importance* Mt 25:40, 45.
[167] μικρός, ά, όν *small* Mt 13:32. *Small* or *young* Mk 15:40. *Little one, child* Mt 18:6, 10, 14. *Humble* Mk 9:42; ὁ μικρότερος *the one of least importance* Mt 11:11. Cf. also 10:42; 26:39, 73.
[168] Stanton (1992) 216.

kindness, even a cup of water, will be rewarded (10:40-42; 25:40, 45). It will be the shepherd judge who exercises justice (25:32-34, 46).

7.5.2 Intertextual Analysis of Mt 25:32

Two ideas emerge from Matthew's use of the biblical tradition. The first is that Jesus is the Son of Man who comes in glory with the angels and then is enthroned to exercise judgment (v 31 with Dan 7:13-14 and Zech 14:5). Second, metaphorically Jesus is the shepherd who both gathers and separates the sheep from the goats and pronounces judgment. These two themes inform the other. The shepherd metaphor is informed by the Son of Man theme. But in light of the Son of David connection with the messianic shepherd, the shepherd metaphor also informs the Son of Man theme.

The internal cross referencing of Matthew concerning the Son of Man has developed the theme and it is now brought to a conclusion at this point in the eschatological discourse. There is a close relationship between 25:31 and 24:30-31. In many ways 24:30-31 is the goal of chapter 24 since the question of the disciples in v 3. The disciples' question (24:3) concerned the 'when' of the Son of Man's coming. But the emphasis of Jesus is not 'when' but is 'to be prepared' (cf. 24:27, 30, 39, 44). Since 24:36 the focus has been on the judgment that will occur when the Son of Man comes. Now, in the concluding pericope, the judgment is described. As noted above, the fact that the Son of Man comes 'in his glory' puts the focus on his dominion and authority (cf. 16:27, where it is 'in the glory of his father'). At this point it should be remembered that the Son of Man who is the shepherd is also depicted as king in 25:34, 40.

This dominion and authority is supported by the intertextual linkage with Daniel 7:13-14 and Zechariah 14:5. 'The background to this reference to the coming

of the Son of Man is, as in the other references, primarily Dan 7:13-14'.[169] Linguistic connections are not as close here as in 24:30 where the Son of Man is 'coming on the clouds of heaven' (ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανου; and Dan 7:13 'ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανου)'. The dominion and authority to rule over πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς is the focus and this will be one aspect that will inform the shepherd image. The other is the Zechariah 14:5 reference where the language is concerning the Lord my God's coming and 'all the angels with him'. Again, the 'glory' is emphasized with the attendance of the angels: Matthew has πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτου and the LXX has πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι μετ' αὐτοῦ. The 'angels' is Matthew's interpretation of the 'holy ones'.[170] There is no further mention of the angels in 25:31, but their presence here connects this text with earlier Matthean texts concerning the Son of Man's coming and they increase the sense of divine authority. The Son of Man in this scene exercises the prerogatives of God as the shepherd judge.

7.5.2.1 Isa 66:18 and Joel 3:1-3 (LXX 4:1-3)

These two texts are considered together because they both allude to 'gathering all the nations'. A view of the texts together follows:

LXX Is 66:18	ἔρχομαι συναγαγεῖν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη
Joel 3:2 (LXX 4:2)	συνάξω πάντα τὰ ἔθνη
Cf. Mt 25:32	καὶ συναχθήσονται ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, All the nations will be gathered before him,

In the two OT passages, God is the one who is doing the gathering. Isaiah depicts the Lord as 'presently coming to gather' (ἔρχομαι συναγαγεῖν) the nations in order that they may see his glory. Both συνάξω (fut. act.) and συναχθήσονται (fut. pass.) are from

[169] Hagner 2:732.
[170] Gundry (1967) 142, '...Mt interpretatively (and correctly) renders קְדֹשִׁים by οἱ ἄγγελοι'.

συνάγω.[171] In Matthew, the Son of Man will come in glory and will act in the place of God. 'Συνάγω is a shepherd's term otherwise used in eschatological contexts'.[172]

The distress of the circumstances of Matthew's own socio-historical setting is countered by the eschatological discourse generally and in the judgment, the promise that justice will be done, even to all the nations.[173]

Among apocalyptic texts Joel 3:1-3 (LXX 4:1-3) is a classic example of hope in the face of distress and near hopelessness that is so characteristic of apocalyptic literature. Matthew 25 relates to this literature because of the historical setting of the last quarter of the first century. This passage is a promise that one day God will bring justice to the nations on behalf of his people.

Joel 3:1	For then, in those days and at that time, when I restore the fortunes of Judah and Jerusalem, 3:2 I will gather all the nations...
Joel 3:2(LXX 4:2)	συνάξω πάντα τὰ ἔθνη
Cf. Mt 25:32	καὶ συναχθήσονται ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη,

Further, note the final three lines of the remainder of the Joel 3:2b-3 passage:

> and I will enter into judgment with [the nations]...,
> on account of my people and my heritage Israel,
> because they have scattered them among the nations.
> They have divided my land,
> **3:3** and cast lots for my people,
> and traded boys for prostitutes,
> and sold girls for wine, and drunk it down.

The final three lines do not linguistically match the Matthean passage. But, as Stanton points out, one of the six concerns are listed in scene six; the plight of the prisoners.[174]

---

[171] A Matthean favorite—συνάγω: Mt 24; Mk 5; Lk 6; συναγωγή/-αί αὐτῶν/ὑμῶν: Mt 6; Mk 2; Lk 1.
[172] Davies and Allison 3:422. Cf. 13:47; Mk 14:27; Jn 11:52; 16:32; T. Benj. 9:2.
[173] Stanton (1992) 223, 'Although I do not think that *literary dependence* between Matthew and any apocalyptic writings can be established beyond doubt, the central theme of 25:31-46 is also found in several apocalyptic writings. Matthew's Gospel, 4 Ezra, 2 Baruch, and at least two sections of I Enoch come from a broadly similar social setting. Their similar 'symbolic worlds' function as consolation to hard-pressed groups of God's people. In these apocalyptic writings the prophetic declaration that God will judge the nation 'on the last day' is a response to the complaint of God's people, or their representative: 'Why do the nations prosper at our expense?' The response is meant to encourage'.

Here, the people of God, 'my heritage Israel', are the *prisoners* who are being abused and violated rather than being 'visited'. Rather than doing mercy the nations abuse. Judgment will therefore come.

7.5.2.2 Ezek 34:17, 20-24

In Ezekiel 34, God himself becomes the shepherd in contrast to the anti-shepherds who have abused and taken advantage of the sheep. Ezekiel describes how he will shepherd the flock of Israel (34:10b-16) and then at 34:23 promises to delegate the task of shepherd to 'my servant David, and he shall feed them' (cf. 37:24). The image that connects Ezekiel 34 and Matthew 25:32 is the shepherd separating the sheep, either at the end of the day for the purposes of safety and warmth or for the other purposes of caring for them (shearing, examining them for health reasons, separating for milking).[175] The relationship of Ezekiel 34:17 to 25:32 is not so much textual but in terms of the image. 'As for you, my flock, thus says the Lord GOD: I shall judge between sheep and sheep, between rams and goats…' As God will judge between sheep and sheep in Ezekiel 34 so will the Son of Man separate the sheep and the goats 'as a shepherd separates' his sheep from the goats. Jeremias emphasizes that while sheep were normally white and the goats normally black this was not the reason for their separation but it was based on the needs of the animal.[176] However that may be, the metaphor for separation in Matthew 25 is for the purposes of depicting the reality of the last judgment.

---

[174] Stanton (1992) 224.

[175] Goats must be kept warmer at night since their coat is finer and cannot withstand the cold as well as the heavy coated fat tailed sheep. For a general description of shepherds, sheep and goats cf. 4.1.1 above. Also Jeremias (1972) 206.

[176] Jeremias *TDNT* 6:499. Color probably had little to do with the separation or helping distinguish between one animal and another. Even if sheep were predominantly white and goats black, sheep living in the pasture lands of Israel surely would not stay white. The separation had much more to do with the needs of the animals.

7.5.3 Contextual Analysis of Mt 25:31-46

It may be for Matthew that this passage where Jesus as the shepherd-king brings judgment to the nations (as the Son of Man and as God's vice-regent) is the climax for the shepherd metaphor in the Gospel. Another text remains wherein the shepherd is struck. But, the power and pathos of the Zechariah prophecy is meant to be held in tension with this promise that one day the shepherd-king will judge the world as the Son of Man. Thus, the final shepherd text of the Gospel is not the final word concerning the shepherd. Beyond Zechariah 13:7 is 14:5 and Daniel 7. For Matthew his passage proves to speak proleptically of the ultimate destiny of the shepherd which is beyond the passion narrative.

In many ways Matthew has reinforced his high Christology. Jesus is the Son of Man of Daniel 7 and the angels will attend him at his promised coming. The dominion, authority and glory was associated with the exalted Danielic figure of chapter seven. Matthew now believes Jesus is the fulfillment of these longstanding Jewish hopes.

While the use of 'king' language may seem abrupt if the shepherd metaphor is in focus, the implication is that the image can imply a king. So, for Matthew the language of king and shepherd used both generally and specifically makes perfect sense in light of the biblical tradition. Often kings are compared to shepherds. Specifically, since chapter 2, Jesus has been the specific Davidic king whose destiny is to 'shepherd my people Israel' (Mt 2:6 and esp. II Sam 5:2 along with Mic 5:2). Matthew 25:34, 40 is not the first time the language of kingship has been or will be used of Jesus in the Gospel.[177] The use of king language for Jesus in this pericope is unique, especially since it is related to both the Son of Man of Daniel 7 and 'my

[177] βασιλεύς—Mt 22; Mk 12; Lk 11; in regard to Jesus Cf. 2:2; 21:5; 27:11, 29, 37, 42.

servant David' (Ezekiel 34:23-24 and 37:24). In Daniel 7:14, one like a Son of Man was given a kingdom (ἐδόθη aor. pass. of δίδωμι) and in Mt 25:4 the Son of Man 'inherit[s]' a kingdom. Earlier in 13:41, the angels are commissioned to attend to the Son of Man's 'kingdom'. It is not difficult in light of these texts and others like them to understand why Matthew associated in the same pericope the Son of Man, the shepherd and the king. Keeping in mind that shepherds and kings were closely associated in the biblical tradition, it may also be that from a narrative point of view Matthew has brought to fulfillment what began with the magi in their search for the King of the Jews (2:2). For Matthew their response of προσεκύνησαν[178] may yet still be part of his literary goal by the end of the Gospel (cf. 28:17).

Before the eschatological end, the redemptive work of the Shepherd-Messiah must come. The last shepherd text emphasizes the final act of Matthew's shepherd. The sacrifice of the shepherd for the flock was often part of the metaphor. The image becomes reality in the passion narrative. Mt 26:31 will bring development of the shepherd metaphor to a conclusion but there is hope beyond the metaphor in the promise of 26:32.

7.5.4 Metaphor Analysis of Mt 25:32

The metaphor of the shepherd who separates the sheep from the goats occurs in the context of 'When the Son of Man comes in his glory'.

All the nations will be gathered before him, and he will separate people one from another
καὶ συναχθήσονται ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, καὶ ἀφορίσει αὐτοὺς ἀπ' ἀλλήλων,

as a shepherd separates the sheep from the goats,
ὥσπερ ὁ ποιμὴν ἀφορίζει τὰ πρόβατα ἀπὸ τῶν ἐρίφων,

---

[178] προσκυνέω—(fall down and) worship, do obeisance to, prostrate oneself before, do reverence to, welcome respectfully.

The *tenor/topic* is the 'nations' and the *vehicle* is 'a shepherd' who separates and so judges the nations. The incongruous part of this metaphor is that a 'shepherd' would be executing eschatological judgment on the 'nations' of the world. The narrative *frame* is shaped most directly by Matthew 25:31 and the eschatological context of the Son of Man coming in his glory with angels and taking his position of authority on 'his glorious throne'.

In the Matthean narrative *frame* the shepherd metaphor does not continue specifically beyond 25:33. Yet, because of the close connections between 'shepherds' as an image for 'kings', the shift to a king in 25:34 is not necessarily surprising but the linguistic shift does refocus the image to more of a royal setting (a throne room?) rather than a shepherd separating his sheep from his goats at the end of the day in the sheep fold. What is consistent throughout the *frame* is the focus on the procedure and basis of the separation of the sheep from the goats.[179]

Even though there is a shift of terms and from shepherd to king this actually may be an extension of the shepherd metaphor with the focus on the royal nature of the shepherd. In light of the often close association of the two terms there may not be as much of a disconnect for Matthew as it initially may appear. This is especially true if Matthew intends a possible literary connection between the child born 'King of the Jews' (Mt 2.2) who will shepherd his people (Mt 2:6) and now the eschatological shepherd judge who will separate the righteous and the wicked at the end of time. Therefore, the introduction of the king into the narrative *frame* may actually be Matthew extending the shepherd metaphor rather than changing it. The shepherd metaphor continues to evoke the many associations established in the biblical tradition.

[179] Cf. 7.5 above.

A number of texts have been considered above[180] that inform the intertextuality of this scene in the Gospel. Therefore it may be proposed that the textual backdrop extends the shepherd-king metaphor to depict Jesus as the eschatological judge. The exalted images, Son of Man and King, extend the shepherd metaphor in a lofty direction even to the point that the shepherd king exercises the prerogatives of God as the shepherd judge. As noted above[181] it may well be, that for Matthew, this scene brings to fulfillment the first of the shepherd texts in Matthew 2:6. Matthew's exalted depiction of Jesus as the eschatological shepherd judge, who exercises his authority in justice and mercy, is in keeping with Jesus' destiny as God's Shepherd-Messiah.

7.6 Introduction and Structure of Mt 26:30-35

Early in chapter 1 I agreed with Jeremias' analysis that the final shepherd text referred to the death of the Shepherd-Messiah.[182] We will now effectively explore Matthew 26:31 and specifically Zech 13:7 but also the possibility that Matthew believed that Jesus identified with the last chapters of Zechariah in a way that shaped the end of his earthly ministry. At another level metaphorically Matthew 26:31 reminds us that the commitment of the faithful shepherd is to protect and redeem the flock and if necessary to put his life in danger against predators, thieves or enemies on behalf of the flock. This text indicates that the shepherd's mission, to protect and care for the sheep, may come at a great cost.

Matthew has Mark as his primary source. He utilizes Mark 14:27 for the biblical citation and utilizes the whole of 14:26-31 as the basis for the pericope.

---

[180] Cf. 7.5.2; 7.5.2.1; 7.5.2.2 above where Dan 7:13-14; Zech 14:5; Isa 66:18; Joel 3:1-3 (LXX 4:1-3) and Ez 34:17, 20-24 are discussed.
[181] Cf. 7.5.3 above.
[182] Jeremias *TDNT* 6:492-493. *Pace* Tooley (1964) 19-20.

Matthew does not eliminate as much of Mark as he sometimes does but, for the length of the pericope, he actually adds a number of significant elements.

Structurally, the passage consists of the predictions of Jesus and the protests of Peter and the disciples. In Mark, the disciples are silent and the dialogue is only between Peter and Jesus. But Matthew includes the other disciples, even if only slightly:

(1) Jesus' prediction that all will be scandalized (v 31a);
(2) Jesus' prediction that he will be struck down (v 32b)
(3) Jesus' promise that he will join them again (v 32);
(4) Peter's protest that he will never fail (v 33);
(4) Jesus' prediction that Peter will fail (v 34);
(6) Peter's protests again that he will never fail (v 35a).
(7) Disciples protest that all will never fail (v 35b).

The focus here, of course, is on the early part of the pericope having to do with the shepherd quotation from Zechariah 13:7 in Matthew 26:31 and Jesus promise to 'go ahead' (προάξω) of them to Galilee (26:32). Jesus promises that he will lead the way and re-gather the disciples in Galilee after they have been scattered. He will meet them again where many of them were first called.[183]

7.6.1 Textual Analysis of Mt 26:31-32

The literary structure after the quotation is centered on the dialogue between Jesus and Peter. Jesus will make two predictions: 1) the defection of all the disciples (πάντες ὑμεῖς σκανδαλισθήσεσθε; v 31). He notes that the cause is 'because of him'(ἐν ἐμοὶ) that they will be scandalized/shocked by his 'being struck'. 2) the prediction of his own outcome. After he is 'struck down' (πατάξω fut. ind. act. of πατάσσω) he will be raised up (ἐγερθῆναί aor. pass. of ἐγείρω) and will meet them again. Peter only seems to hear the first prediction because he offers two protests. Note the Matthean

[183] προάγω: continues the shepherd metaphor (cf. Mic 2:12-13) and also refers to leadership (cf. 2 Macc 10:1).Cf. Davies and Allison 3:486.

symmetry, in verses 33: 'Though all fall because of you (πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται ἐν σοί,), I will never fall'(ἐγὼ οὐδέποτε σκανδαλισθήσομαι). The following is a comparison of the two texts according to the analysis being made here:

26:31 *Τότε* λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· **πάντες** ὑμεῖς σκανδαλισθήσεσθε ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν **τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ**, *γέγραπται* **γάρ**·	**14:27** *καὶ* λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι **πάντες** σκανδαλισθήσεσθε, ὅτι *γέγραπται*·
πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ διασκορπισθήσονται τὰ πρόβατα τῆς ποίμνης.	πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ τὰ πρόβατα διασκορπισθήσονται.
26:32 μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με προάξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.	**14:28** ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με προάξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.
26:33 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν αὐτῷ· εἰ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται ἐν σοί, ἐγὼ οὐδέποτε σκανδαλισθήσομαι.	**14:29** ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἔφη αὐτῷ· εἰ καὶ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγώ.
26:34 ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀμὴν λέγω σοι ὅτι **ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ** πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι τρὶς ἀπαρνήσῃ με.	**14:30** καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀμὴν λέγω σοι ὅτι σὺ σήμερον **ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ** πρὶν ἢ δὶς ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ.
26:35 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος· κἂν δέῃ με σὺν σοὶ ἀποθανεῖν, οὐ μή σε ἀπαρνήσομαι. ὁμοίως καὶ **πάντες** οἱ μαθηταὶ εἶπαν.	**14:31** ὁ δὲ ἐκπερισσῶς ἐλάλει· ἐὰν δέῃ με συναποθανεῖν σοι, οὐ μή σε ἀπαρνήσομαι. ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ **πάντες** ἔλεγον.

Matthew adds 'in this night' in the opening prediction in regard to all (πάντες) the disciples (v 31, ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ,) and so creates a kind of *inclusio* with the phrase (v 34). When Jesus predicts Peter's defection, it is with the added emphasis πρὶν. (ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ πρὶν). The phrase concerning the night is found in Mark only at the end of the pericope (Mk 14:30). Mark does emphasize πάντες (Mk 14:27 and 31) and Matthew follows (Mt 26:31 and 35). But Matthew focuses the emphasis by adding that

the disciples also will be scandalized, not just Peter: καὶ πάντες οἱ μαθηταὶ εἶπαν. Again what is demonstrated by a close comparison of the texts is Matthew's literary approach and how he follows his sources but accomplishes his own redactional purposes.

7.6.2 Intertextual Analysis of Mt 26:31-32

The final shepherd text, Matthew 26:31, is a marked quote (γέγραπται) from Zechariah 13:7. Zechariah 13:7 though marked is not a 'formula' quotation but uses γέγραπται. Matthew follows Mark closely but does engage in his typical redactional shaping of the quotation and the pericope in order to emphasize his specific intentions.

Concerning the quotation from Zechariah 13:7 the most significant change Matthew makes is the addition of τῆς ποίμνης 'of the flock' to the citation (highlighted below). This addition, again, is Matthew's tendency to adjust Mark to be closer to the LXX. In this case Matthew appears to be following the Alexandrinus text of the LXX.[184] This shift toward the LXX usage emphasizes the relationship between the flock and the shepherd. This makes sense in light of his consistent use of the shepherd metaphor from the beginning of the Gospel till now. The table below (on the following page) illustrates how the Gospel writers use Zechariah and where Matthew agrees or departs from Mark.

[184] Cf. Rahlfs (1935) 2:559, loc. cit. textual apparatus.

Matthew 26:31	**Zechariah 13:7**	**Mark 14:27**
Τότε λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· πάντες ὑμεῖς	ῥομφαία ἐξεγέρθητι ἐπὶ τοὺς ποιμένας μου καὶ ἐπ' ἄνδρα πολίτην μου λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ	καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι πάντες
σκανδαλισθήσεσθε ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ, γέγραπται γάρ·		σκανδαλισθήσεσθε, ὅτι γέγραπται·
πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ διασκορπισθήσονται	πατάξατε τοὺς ποιμένας καὶ ἐκσπάσατε	πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ
τὰ πρόβατα	τὰ πρόβατα καὶ ἐπάξω τὴν χεῖρά μου ἐπὶ	τὰ πρόβατα διασκορπισθήσονται.
τῆς ποίμνης.	τοὺς ποιμένας	

The highlighted τῆς ποίμνης in the table above shows where Matthew has added 'of the flock'. This again brings him closer to the LXX-A. Matthew's re-insertion of τῆς ποίμνης does in fact focus attention on the relations of flock with the ποιμένα.

Jesus points to his own death through the word of the prophecy from Zechariah concerning the shepherd being 'struck down'. The 'sheep of the flock' (τὰ πρόβατα τῆς ποίμνης) being scattered alludes to the running away of the disciples. Matthew follows his source, Mark, in regard to the 'scattering' (διασκορπισθήσονται) of the disciples. The divine authority of the biblical citation is emphasized by the use of γέγραπται. This event is happening as it had been predicted according to Matthew: 'To say that God strikes the shepherd is to affirm that the death of Jesus is paradoxically the divine will (cf. esp. vv 24, 54)'.[185]

The verb is first in the phrase 'πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα,' for emphasis. The shepherd shall be 'struck down' and the sheep will flee in confusion. Matthew follows Mark in changing the LXX-A πατάξατε ('smite'—aor. imper. act.) to πατάξω ('I will

[185] Hagner 2:777.

smite'—fut. ind. act.). Here it is God who acts against the shepherd. This will be a cause for the disciples to 'stumble and fall' (σκανδαλίζω). The context of Zechariah 13:7-9 speaks of a remnant that will be left and though the testing will be restored, 'I will put this third in the fire, refine them as one refines silver, and test them as gold is tested'. The remnant will come through and say, 'The Lord is our God' (v 9). This too will be the outcome of the scattered and devastated disciples. Only the prediction of 26:32 softens the difficulty of the word in 26:31, but in the context of the pericope it is as though Peter and the disciples do not even hear v 32. προάγω is 'to lead' or 'go before' (26:32) and continues the shepherd imagery. The image of the shepherd 'leading' the flock to its destination possibly could indicate that Jesus' promise imagines a new day and a new beginning after the time of trial and distress. The common practice of the shepherd is to go before the flock and the sheep follow toward the destination. Except at the end of the day when they are heading back to the sheepfold then the shepherd follows behind to gather strays and protect the flock.[186] The promise of Matthew 26:32 is revisited in 28:7 and the disciples meet Jesus in Galilee in 28:16-20.

7.6.3 Contextual Analysis of Mt 26:30-35

In the context of Zechariah 9-14 Jesus may well have seen his own ministry situation in light of these chapters.[187] It is also important to note that the quotation from Zechariah 13:7 comes from the lips of Jesus and is not a 'formula' quotation or 'fulfillment' quotation by the Evangelist. Zechariah 11 while not intertextualy related to this passage is part of the biblical tradition that was used to inform the passion

---

[186] Jeremias *TDNT* 6:493 n 80.
[187] Cf. Jeremias *TDNT* 6:492-493; *Pace* Tooley (1964) 18-19; Bruce (1968) 105-106; Baldwin (1975) 198; France (1971) 103, 107.

narrative (e.g. Zech 11:13//Mt 27:9-10).[188] Jesus may well have interpreted his own ministry in light of the prophet who gave himself to the service of *YHWH* but was rejected by the people. God then gives the people the leadership they want. When they have rejected the servant of *YHWH* they have effectively rejected *YHWH*. The struck down shepherd in the final reference to the shepherd in Matthew's Gospel speaks after all of the redemption and the sacrifice of the shepherd on behalf of the flock. Jesus' predictions of his death will be substantiated by many texts from the biblical tradition in the passion narrative. Just as the death of the shepherd has distressing effects on the sheep in the original context of Zechariah's prophecy, so it will have a devastating effect on the disciples. The rest of the pericope indicates their unwillingness to accept this fate for Jesus. Yet, Jesus the shepherd will be struck down by God and will die. The final dimension of the shepherd metaphor has been put in place by Matthew; the shepherd is sacrificed for the flock and becomes the shepherd redeemer.

7.6.4 Metaphor Analysis of Mt 26:31

The final shepherd metaphor is found in the passion narrative:

'I will strike the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock will be scattered'.
πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ διασκορπισθήσονται τὰ πρόβατα τῆς ποίμνης.

The image is taken from Zechariah 13:7 and speaks of the smiting (πατάξω) that the shepherd will endure and the flock is scandalized and scattered as a result. The *tenor/topic* is the 'I' of the text and may be identified as 'God' according to the context, while the *vehicle* is the shepherd. The *vehicle* is further modified by the scattering of 'the sheep of the flock'.[189]

In Matthew the larger context *frame* is the passion narrative and Jesus understands himself to be the one who will be 'struck down'. The immediate *frame*

[188] Cf. Ham (2005) 47-51; Laniak (2006) 192-194.
[189] Cf. 3.1.2.3 above. Soskice (1985) 46.

involves the issues of faithfulness and falling away in regard to the disciples. As noted above,[190] Matthew's inclusion of τῆς ποίμνης in the quotation emphasizes the close connection between the flock and the shepherd (ποιμένα). This final use of the shepherd/sheep metaphor in Matthew's Gospel anticipates the death of the shepherd and is only softened by 26:32; the promise that the shepherd will re-gather the scattered flock and be reunited with them. Through the use of Zechariah 13:7 Jesus is depicted as the shepherd who will be sacrificed for the flock and struck down by God. But, as a result, a remnant will be re-gathered as in Zechariah 13:9, 'They will call on my name, and I will answer them. I will say, "They are my people"; and they will say, "The Lord is our God"'.

7.7 Summary

What I have tried to do in this chapter is indicate how the five shepherd texts do in fact establish Jesus as the Shepherd-Messiah. One of Matthew's common literary techniques is to introduce a theological theme early in his Gospel and then throughout the narrative revisit that theme and in the process nuance and expound on the theme. Matthew has done this with the shepherd metaphor in regard to Jesus. Beginning in the infancy narrative and moving through the Gospel to the passion narrative. At specific narrative points Matthew has introduced the shepherd motif in order to develop his christological theme regarding Jesus as Shepherd-Messiah. In the infancy narrative Jesus is introduced as the royal shepherd and the shepherd who like Moses will become a deliver. The righteous shepherd is contrasted with the evil shepherd ruler, Herod who wants to destroy God's Shepherd-Messiah. The tension between righteous leadership and unfaithful/evil leadership is continued along with the Moses typology in Matthew 9:36. Faithful under-shepherds, the disciples, are introduced into the

[190] Cf. 7.6.2 above.

narrative in order to extend Jesus' ministry. The story of a Canaanite woman is used by Matthew to help explain Jesus' mission to 'the lost sheep of the house of Israel' and the presence of Gentiles in early Christianity. The Shepherd-Messiah will become the eschatological judge who will, like a shepherd, divide the sheep from the goats. Finally, Matthew understands that God will 'smite' the shepherd in order to accomplish redemption for the people of God. Through this narrative strategy Matthew has developed the christological portrait of Jesus as Shepherd-Messiah.

CONCLUDING SUMMARY

It is my conviction that this thesis has provided evidence to substantiate and support the primary aims and purposes of this study. I will now offer a summary review of what this study has tried to argue.

First, I have argued that Matthew believed that Jesus was the Shepherd-Messiah, specifically the righteous and royal Shepherd-Messiah, who comes to give leadership to the people of God in the aftermath of the Jewish war. The last quarter of the first century C.E. was a formative period for early Judaism. For Matthew, it was in this context that he understood Jesus to be the defining figure for the future of the people of God. I have argued that Matthew presents Jesus as fulfilling the biblical tradition in regard to the hoped for Shepherd-Messiah. First, concerning his royal lineage as part of the Davidic tradition, Matthew has introduced Jesus as 'king of the Jews' in the infancy narrative (2:1-12) and based on the compound quote from II Samuel 5:2 and Micah 5:2(1) has further indicated his royal heritage.[1] But also toward the end of the Gospel, just prior to the passion narrative, Matthew has presented him as the royal shepherd who will judge with a righteous justice between the sheep and the goats at the eschatological end (25:31-46). Jesus the shepherd is associated with the Son of Man (25:31; cf. Dan 7:13-14; Zech 14:5), but also is described as the 'king' who will exercise just judgment (25:34, 40). So, Jesus is presented as fulfilling the role of royal Shepherd-Messiah by fulfilling the role of David, his prototype. Second, Jesus' royal status as the Shepherd-Messiah has been demonstrated in righteousness, justice and compassion. This has already been alluded to in regard to the eschatological judgment in Matthew 25. For Matthew this can be authoritatively

[1] Matthew's opening (1:1) the genealogy (1:2-17) and his birth (2:18-25) have already presented his royal lineage as well.

demonstrated on the basis of the biblical tradition. Though he does not use any of his 'formula' quotations in regard to the shepherd metaphor, all of the shepherd texts are strongly, if not directly supported by the biblical tradition. So, in the story of the magi he not only gives the royal quotation at Mt 2:6 but also alludes to the royal Psalm 72, which celebrates the righteous (72:2, 3, 7) and just rule of the king (72:1-4). The quality of compassion is directly associated with the shepherd metaphor in Mt 9:36. Jesus has compassion on the crowds and in response extends his ministry to the crowds through the commissioning of the twelve (10:1, 5-8). The theme of compassion and the crowds is further developed by Matthew as well (14:14; 15:32). This, in part, is why Matthew believes Jesus to be the defining figure for Judaism in his own time and for the future. As the Shepherd-Messiah, in fulfillment of the biblical tradition, Matthew presents Jesus as the shepherd who is willing to lay down his life for the flock and be 'struck down' in order that the sheep will be redeemed (Mt 26:31//Zech 13:7). The flock are initially scattered, but they will be gathered again after he is 'raised up' (ἐγερθῆναί) and 'goes ahead' (προάξω) of the sheep to Galilee (Mt 26:32; cf. 28:7).

The shepherd metaphor is used by the Evangelist especially to expand and extend his Christology. For Matthew the shepherd metaphor had wide-ranging capabilities that allowed him to nuance his christological concerns. Regarding Jesus as Shepherd-Messiah he was able to further explore characteristics of Jesus like the son of David theme, righteousness and justice, compassion and care, judgment and redemption. The son of Man as Shepherd-Messiah is the eschatological judge. The miracle-worker and healer of Matthew's Christology is related to the compassion of the shepherd motif coming as it does in Mt 9:36 after the 'miracle' chapters 8-9. Yet,

the shepherd metaphor is not all inclusive because Matthew emphasizes other christological motifs; for example, he emphasizes that Jesus is the authoritative interpreter of the law, that his understanding and interpretation of the law should be the way forward for Israel and the nations (e.g. Mt 5-7; 7:28-29).

The way Matthew establishes Jesus as the Shepherd-Messiah is based upon his understanding and use of the biblical tradition. I have examined in this study Matthew's use of the biblical tradition and have attempted to show Matthew's use of the OT. I have noted that the shepherd texts themselves are closely connected to the biblical tradition; for example, by the two marked quotations (e.g. 2:6; 26:31). While these are not among Matthew's unique 'formula' quotations they none the less continue his use of the biblical tradition to establish his conviction that Jesus has fulfilled the OT promises concerning the Messiah. Also, by unmarked quotes (9:36) and numerous allusions (Ps 72; Jer 3:15; 23:1-6; 50:6; Ez 34; 37:24-25; Zech 10:2; 11-14 and others) Matthew has attempted to establish beyond doubt that Jesus is the Shepherd-Messiah.

Along with that the thesis has examined how the shepherd metaphor was used in the ANE and the Greco-Roman world generally. The image of the shepherd was used of kings and leaders throughout the ancient world. The biblical tradition also used the metaphor, but because of the uniqueness of *YHWH*, the image is primarily reserved for *YHWH* as the shepherd of Israel. While the OT would use the shepherd motif for kings and leaders generally, as a way to emphasize that *YHWH* alone was the unique shepherd of Israel, no king or leader was ever given the specific title 'Shepherd of Israel'. The kings and leaders of Israel were under-shepherds of *YHWH.* The character and nature of their leadership was directly related to their relationship with God, who was the true shepherd of Israel. In the biblical tradition the shepherd image

developed in two primary streams, the Moses/exodus tradition and the royal Davidic tradition. These two were adopted and then extended through the prophetic tradition who introduced the tradition of the unfaithful or evil shepherd. This study has reviewed how these traditions developed in the OT and Second Temple Judaism and then came to inform and influence Matthew. Matthew uses the Moses/exodus tradition to argue that Jesus was a deliverer/redeemer, like Moses, who was leading the people of God in a second exodus. The royal Davidic tradition was employed to establish that Jesus was the Shepherd-Messiah who will rule with righteousness and compassion. Both traditions contribute to Matthew's understanding of what the new leadership of the people of God should look like. The prophetic tradition concerning the unfaithful or evil shepherd is contrasted with this new vision of leadership in the kingdom. For example, Jesus in the infancy narrative is the 'king of the Jews' but also the new Moses who is contrasted with evil Herod the current evil 'shepherd/king', like the pharaoh of Egypt. His kingship is genuine and will ultimately be vindicated. Jesus will also appoint and raise up shepherds (as foretold in Jeremiah 3:15; 23:4) who will extend his ministry and accomplish his mission.

The last quarter of the first century C.E. was a time of national crises following the Jewish war that resulted in the fall of Jerusalem and the loss of the Temple. The shepherd metaphor had been used before by the prophets in the context of national crises and contested leadership. During the time of the exilic and post-exilic prophets the motif had been used to describe the evil shepherds and their abuses. But it was also used in contrast to offer hope for a better day. It is my conviction that Matthew understood his own time to be similar, a time of national crisis and contested leadership. For Matthew Jesus as the Shepherd-Messiah and the whole of his christological understanding of Jesus—Immanuel, Son of God and Lord, authoritative

teacher and interpreter of the law, wisdom incarnate, healer and miracle-worker, greater than Moses, Solomon, and Jonah, Son of Abraham, Son of David and triumphant Son of Man—Jesus was to be the defining figure for Judaism. In Matthew's own time he had argued strongly that Jesus came to his own people first and foremost (10:5, 15:24). Jesus came first to the lost sheep of the house of Israel in order to establish a new covenant with them. They were his chosen people and Jesus' ministry was to them. I think that Matthew wanted to convince his Jewish kinsmen that Jesus' mission and message of the kingdom was to them first. Yet, this gospel of the kingdom would not be refused to the nations if they would believe in him (8:5-13; 15:21-28). This fact, in spite of Jesus' priority during his earthly ministry, put the Christian-Jewish community at odds with emerging Rabbinic Judaism. Whatever the actual contact and relationship with other Jews, the realities and ultimate implications of Matthew's Christology would, by necessity, lead to a decision: Is Jesus the Christ or is he not? For Matthew the Shepherd-Messiah of the biblical tradition had come in Jesus of Nazareth. That is the message of his Gospel.

Through the use of intertextuality and the use of metaphor Matthew is able to create the possibility for the reader/hearer to make connections and associations that enrich the shepherd image. In considering the different theories of metaphor I intended to review the different ways metaphor has been understood to function. My own proposal is that metaphor gives us a way of speaking about God and/or divine things that is reality-depicting but does not claim to be definitive or overly descriptive and thereby remains open-ended. Also, while metaphor originates in language use and not some sort of mental event, language does express ideas and elicits cognitive

associations, recognitions, and comparisons. Following Soskice and Kittay,[2] I argued that an *interanimation/perspectival* approach emphasizes that metaphors are understood in the context of discourse and are contextually conditioned. We have seen this in the consideration of the shepherd metaphor in Matthew and the biblical tradition. Metaphors draw upon underlying models, in the case of this study, shepherds and sheep and the environment in which they live and work. These models create the network of ideas and images that enable metaphorical description. The biblical writers utilize the shepherd metaphor to give expression to what they believe to be revelation and their faith in the God who makes himself known.

I have argued in this thesis that Matthew understands Jesus to be the Shepherd-Messiah with all the possible attending images that the biblical tradition might allow him to utilize. And yet, as wide-ranging and as effectively as Matthew has been in employing the image, I do not intend to claim that the metaphor is the dominant description of Jesus in his Gospel. For Matthew, Jesus is too amazing to be categorized by one title or one metaphor or one typological correspondence. He will accumulate and amass his material together by way of his many literary techniques in order to present Jesus as fully as he can. He uses, what I have come to believe, his literary genius to give his reader/hearer as full a portrait of Jesus as he is able. But even given that and taking together the whole of his Gospel, Matthew seems to leave his reader/hearer with the impression that Jesus can not be summed up even by all the titles, typologies and metaphors available. For Matthew, Jesus is always being revealed more fully to his church, because for Matthew Jesus is 'God with us', present with his followers always, even to the end of the age (Mt 1:23; 18:20; 28:20).

---

[2] Cf. Chapter 3.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: PRIMARY TEXTS CONSULTED

The Bibliographic style and most of the abbreviations in this thesis are those recommended by the Society of Biblical Literature, *The SBL Handbook of Style*, published by Hendrickson, 1999.

Aland, K. et al., eds.
1993. *The Greek New Testament.* 4th ed. Bibelgesellschaft/United Bible Societies. Stuttgart: Deutsche.

Alexander, Patrick H. et al., eds.
1999. *The SBL Handbook of Style for Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies.* Peabody: Hendrickson.

Allegro, J.M.
1968. *Qumran Cave 4.I (4Q158-4Q520).* DJD V. Oxford: Clarendon.

The Aramaic Bible. The Targums.
1987-92. Edited by Kevin Cathcart, Michael Maher and Martin McNamara. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Aristotle.
1965. *The Poetics.* Translated by W. Hamilton Fyfe. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bauer, W., F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, F.W. Gingrich, eds.
2000. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* 3rd ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Baumgarten, J. M.
1996. *Qumran Cave 4.XIII (4Q266-273).* DJD XVIII. Oxford: Clarendon.

Benoit, P., J.T. Milik and R. de Vaux, eds.
1961. *Les Grottes de Murabba `at.* DJD II. Oxford: Clarendon.

Blass, F., A. Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk.
1961. *A Greek and Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

A Concordance to the Greek Testament.
1953. Edited by W.F. Moulton and A.S. Geden. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

A Concordance to the Septuagint.
1998. Edited by Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker.

The Critical Edition of Q.
2000. Edited by James M. Robinson, Paul Hoffmann, and John S. Kloppenborg. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition.
1997. Edited by Florentino Garcia Martinez and Elbert J. Tigchelaar. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill.

Denis, Albert-Marie.
1987. *Concordance Grecque Des Pseudepigraphes D'ancien Testament.* Louvain-la-Neuve: Universite Catholique de Louvain, Institut orentaliste.

Elliger, K., and W. Rudolph, eds.
1984. *Biblia Hebraica Stuffgartensia.* Editio Minor. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

I Enoch.
1983. Translated by E. Isaac. Pages 5-89 in vol. 1 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha.* Edited by J.H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. Garden City: Doubleday.

The Fourth Book of Ezra.
1983. Translated by B. M. Metzger. Pages 517-59 in vol. 1 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha.* Edited by J.H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. Garden City: Doubleday.

A Greek English Lexicon of the Septuagint.
2004. Edited by J. Lust, E. Eynikel and K. Hauspie. New York: American Bible Society.

Holladay, William L.
1984. *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Josephus.
1836. Edited by William Whiston. *The Works of Josephus: Updated Edition.* Peabody: Hendrickson, 1987.

1926-1965. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray et al. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

2003. Translation and Commentary by Steve Mason. *Life of Josephus.* Leiden: Brill.

Liddell and Scott.
1993. Edited by Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott. Abridged from *Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon.* Oxford: Clarendon.

Lexical Semantics of the Greek New Testament
1992. *A Supplement to the Greek-English Lexicon Based on Semantic Domains.* Edited by Eugen A. Nida and Johannes P. Louw. Society of Biblical Literature Resources for Biblical Studies 25. Atlanta: Scholars.

The Midrash on Psalms.
1959. Translated by William G. Braude. 2 vols. New Haven: Yale University Press.

The Mishnah.
1933. Translated by Herbert Dandy. London: Oxford University Press.

Philo of Alexandria.
1926-62. Translated by F.H. Colson, G.H. Whitaker and R. Markus. 10 vols. And 2 supplementary vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Philo.
1994. Edited by C.D.Yonge. *The Works of Philo.* Peabody: Hendrickson.

Plutarch.
1935. *Plutarch's Moralia, vol. 5*, with an English Translation by Frank Cole Babbitt. 15 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Pritchard, James B.
1958. *The Ancient Near East: Volume 1.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

1969. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts: Third Edition with Supplement.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

1975. *The Ancient Near East: Volume 2.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Pseudo-Philo.
1983. Translated by D. J. Harrington. Pages 297-377 in vol. 1 of *The Old Testament Psedepigrapha.* Edited by J.H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. Garden City: Doubleday.

Puech, E.
1998. *Textes Hebreux (4Q521-4Q528, 4Q576-4Q579): Qumran Cave* 4.XVIII. DJD XXV. Oxford: Clarendon.

The Septuagint.
1935. Alfred Rahlfs, ed. Stuttagart: Deutsche Biblegesellschaft.

Psalms of Solomon.
1982. Translated by R.B. Wright. Pages 639-70 in vol. 2 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha.* Edited by J.H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. Garden City: Doubleday.

Quintilian.
1921. *The Institution Oratoria of Quintilian, vol. 3*, with an English Translation by H. E. Butler. The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 4 Vols.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: SECONDARY WORKS CONSULTED

Aaron, David H.

2001. *Biblical Ambiguities: Metaphor, Semantics and Divine Imagery.* Vol. 4 of *The Brill Reference Library of Ancient Judaism.* Edited by J. Neusner, H. Basser, et. al. Leiden: Brill.

Achtemeier, Paul J.

1981. 'Resources for Pastoral Ministry in the Synoptic Gospels.' Pages 145-85 in *A Biblical Basis for Ministry.* Edited by: E.E. Shelp and R. Sunderland. Philadelphia: Westminster.

1990. 'Omne Verbum Sonat: The New Testament and the Oral Environment of Late Western Antiquity in Journal of Biblical Literature.' *American Theology Library Association* 109: 3-27.

Albright, William Foxwell.

1967. *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan.* New York: Doubleday.

1976. 'Moses in Historical and Theological Perspective.' Pages120-31 in *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernst Wright.* Garden City: Doubleday.

Alexander, P.

1999. '"The Parting of the Ways" from the Perspective of Rabbinic Judaism.' Pages 1-25 in *Jews and Christians: The Parting of Ways A.D. 70 to 135.* Edited by J.D.G. Dunn. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

2000. 'Rules.' Vol. 2, Pages 799-803 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Edited by
Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Allen, Leslie C.

1990. *Ezekiel 20-48, Volume 29. Word Biblical Commentary.* Edited by Bruce M. Metzger, David A Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker. Nashville: Thomas Nelson.

Allison, Dale C.

1983. 'Matthew 23:39 – Lk. 13.35b as a Conditional Prophecy.' *Journal for the Study of the New Testament.* 18:75-84.

1988. 'Two Notes on a Key Text: Matthew 11:25-30.' *Journal of Theological Studies.* 39:477-85.

1992. 'Matthew: Structure, Biographical Impulse and the Imitatio Christi.' Pages 1203-1221 in *The Four Gospels, Festschrift Frans Neirynck.* Edited by F. Van Segbroeck. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

1993. *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology.* Minneapolis: Fortress.

1995. 'Anticipating the Passion: The Literary Reach of Matthew 26:47-27:56.' *Catholic Bible Quarterly.* 56:701-14.

1997. *The Jesus Tradition in Q.* Harrisburg: Trinity.

1998. *Jesus of Nazareth.* Minneapolis: Fortress.

1999. *The Sermon on the Mount.* New York: Crossroad.

2000. *The Intertextual Jesus.* Harrisburg: Trinity.

2000a. *Scriptural Allusions in the New Testament: Light from the Dead Sea Scrolls,* in *Dead Sea Scrolls & Christian Origins Library, vol. 5.* Richland Hills, TX: BIBAL.

2000b. 'The Eschatology of Jesus.' Pages 267-202 in vol. 1 of *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity.* Edited by John J. Collins. 3 vols. London: Continuum.

2005. *Resurrecting Jesus: The Earliest Christian Tradition and its Interpreters.* New York:
T&T Clark.

2005a. *Studies in Matthew: Interpretation Past and Present.* Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

2005b. 'The Magi's Angel (Matt. 2:2, 9-10).' Pages 17-41 in *Studies in Matthew: Interpretation Past and Present.* Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Andersen, Francis I. and David Noel Freedman.

1965. *Micah: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary.* The Anchor Bible. Edited by William Foxwell Albright & David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday.

Anderson, Bernard W.

2000. *Out of the Depths: The Psalms Speak for us Today, Third Edition.* Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Anderson, Janice Capel.

1996. 'Matthew: Sermon and Story.' Pages 233-50 in *Treasures New and Old: Contributions to Matthean Studies.* Edited by David R. Bauer and Mark Allen Powell. SBL Symposium 1. Atlanta: Scholars.

1994. *Matthew's Narrative Web: Over, and Over, and Over Again.* JSNTSup 91. Sheffield: Journal of the Study of the Old Testament.

2001. 'Matthew: Gender and Reading.' Pages 25-51 in *A Feminist Companion of Matthew.* Cleveland: Pilgrim.

Anderson, Ray S.
1979. *Theological Foundations For Ministry: Selected Readings for a Theology of the Church in Ministry.* Grand Rapids: T. & T. Clark/Eerdmans.

Archi, Alfonso.
1993. '*Kamrusepa* and the Sheep of the Sun-God.' *Orientalia* 62: 404-409.

Attridge, H.W.
1984. 'Josephus and His Works.' Pages 185-232 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period.* Edited by Michael E. Stone. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Aune, David E.
1982. *Prophecy in Early Christianity.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

1987. *The New Testament in its Literary Environment.* Philadelphia: Westminster.

1999. 'Between Two Worlds: Gentiles and Jewish Christians in Matthew's Gospel.' *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 61: 1-23.

2001. *The Gospel of Matthew in Current Study.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

2003. *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament & Early Christian Literature & Rhetoric.* Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Avis, Paul.
1999. *God and the Creative Imagination.* New York: Routledge.

Bailey, Kenneth E.
1993. 'The Shepherd Poems of John 10: Their Culture and Style.' *Theological Review* 14:3-21.

Balaban, Victor.
1999. 'Religious Metaphor and Cognitive Linguistics: Perceptual Metaphors for Knowledge at a Marian Apparition Site.' Pages 253-271 in *Metaphor and God-talk.* Edited by L. Boeve and K. Feyaerts. Vol. 2 of *Religions and Discourse.* Edited by James Francis. New York: Peter Lang.

Balch, David L., ed.
1991. *Social History of the Matthean Community: Cross-Disciplinary Approaches.* Minneapolis: Fortress.

Baldwin, Joyce.
1975. *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi: An Introduction and Commentary* in *Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity.

Banks, Robert.
1992. *God the Worker: Journeys in the Mind, Heart and Imagination of God.* Claremont: Albatross.

Barcelona, Antonio.
1999. 'The Metaphorical and Metonymic Understanding of the Trinitarian Dogma.' Pages 187-213 in *Metaphor and God-talk.* Vol. 2 of *Religions and Discourse.* Edited by James Francis. New York: Peter Lang.

Barclay, John M.G.
1983. 'Deviance and Apostasy: Some applications of deviance theory to first-century Judaism and Christianity.' Pages 114-27 in *Modeling early Christianity: Social-scientific studies of the New Testament in its context.* Edited by P.F. Esler. London: Routledge.

1995. 'Paul among Diaspora Jews: Anomaly or Apostate?' *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 60: 89-120.

1996. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora.* Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Barth, Gerhard.
1963. 'Matthew's Understanding of the Law.' Pages 58-164 in *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*. Translated by P. Scott. Edited by G. Bornkamm, G. Barth, and H.J. Held. Philadelphia: Westminster.

Barton, Stephen C.
1992. *The Spirituality of the Gospels.* Peabody: Hendrickson.

1993. *Discipleship and Family Ties in Mark and Matthew.* SNTSMS 80 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1994. 'Historical Criticism and Social-Scientific Perspectives in New Testament Studies.' Pages 61-89 in *Hearing the New Testament.* Edited by Joel B. Green. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

1997. *Invitation to the Bible.* London: SPCK.

1998. 'Can We Identify the Gospel Audiences?' Pages 173-94 in *The Gospels for All Christians.* Edited by Richard Bauckham. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

1999. 'Gospel Wisdom.' Pages 93-110 in *Where Shall Wisdom Be Found? Wisdom in the Bible, the Church and the Contemporary World.* Edited by Stephen C. Barton. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

2001. *Life Together: Family, Sexuality and Community in the New Testament and Today.* New York: T&T Clark.

2001a. 'The Communal Dimension of Earliest Christianity.' Pages 85-116 in *Life Together: Family, Sexuality and Community in the New Testament and Today.* New York: T&T Clark.

2003. 'Dislocating and Relocating Holiness: A New Testament Study.' Pages 193-213 in *Holiness Past and Present.* Edited by Stephen C. Barton. New York: T&T Clark.

Barton, Stephen C. ed.
2006. *The Cambridge Companion to the Gospels.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bar-Yosef. O. and A. Khazonov, eds..
1992. 'Introduction.' Pages 1-10 in *Pastoralism in the Levant, Archaelogical Material in Anthropological Perspective.* Madison: Prehistory.

Bauckham, Richard ed.
1998. *The Gospels for All Christians.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

1998a. 'Response to P.F. Esler Review.' *Scottish Journal of Theology* 51: 249-253.

Bauer, David R.
1988. *The Structure of Matthew's Gospel: A Study in Literary Design,* JSNTSSup 31. Sheffield: Almond.

1992. 'The Major Characters of Matthew's Story: Their Function and Significance.' *Interpretation* 46/4:357-67.

1995. 'The Kingship of Jesus in the Matthean Infancy Narrative: A Literacy Analysis.' *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 57:306-23.

Bauer, David R. and Mark Allen Powell, eds.
1996. *Treasures New and Old. Recent Contributions to Matthean Studies.* SBL Symposium 1. Atlanta: Scholars.

Baumgarten, Joseph M.
2000. 'Damascus Document.' Pages 166-170, Vol.1 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Edited by Lawrence Schiffman & James VanderKam. Oxford:Oxford University Press.

Beale, G. K.
1994. *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Text? Essays in the Use of the Old Testament in the New.* Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Beardsley, Monroe C.
1958. *Aesthetics: Problems in the Philosophy of Criticism.* New York: Harcourt & Brace.

1967. 'Metaphor' Pages 284-289, Vol. 5-6 in *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy.* Edited by Paul Edwards. New York: Macmillan.

Beare, Francis Wright.
1981. *The Gospel According to Matthew.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Beattie, D.R.G. and M.J. McNamara, eds.
1994. *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context.* Sheffield: JSOT Press

Beaton, Richard.
2002. *Isaiah's Christ in Matthew's Gospel.* SNTSMS 123 U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

2005. 'How Matthew writes.' Pages 116-134 in *The Written Gospel.* Edited by Markus Bockmuehl and Donald A. Hagner. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Begg, Christopher.
1988. 'Identity of the three building sheep in I Enoch 89:72-73.' *Ephemerides Theologica Lovanienses* 64:152-156.

Bernstein, Moshe J.
2001. 'Pesher Psalms' Pages 655-656 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Betz, Hans Dieter.
1967. 'The Logion of the Easy Yoke and of Rest: Matthew 11:28-30.' *Journal of Biblical Literature* 86:10-24.

1990. 'The Problem of Christology in the Sermon on the Mount.' Pages 191-209 in *Text and Logos: The Humanistic Interpretation of the New Testament.* Edited by T.W. Jennings. Atlanta: Scholars.

1990a. 'The Sermon on the Mount and Q: Some Aspects of the Problem.' Pages 19-34 in *Gospel Origins and Christian Beginnings: In Honor of James M. Robinson.* Edited by J.E. Goehring et al. Sonoma, Cal.: Polebridge.

1991. 'The Sermon on the Mount in Matthew's Interpretation.' Pages 258-75 in *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester.* Edited by B.A. Pearson. Minneapolis: Fortress.

1995. *The Sermon on the Mount.* Hermeneia-A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Beutler, Johannes, S.J. and Robert Fortna, eds.
1991. *The Shepherd Discourse of John 10 and its Context.* Society for New Testament Studies 67. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beyreuther E.
1978. 'Shepherd.' Pages 564-69 in vol. 3 of *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology.* Edited by Colin Brown, 3 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Biebuyck, Benjamin, Rene Dirven and John Ries.
1998. *Faith and Fiction: Interdisciplinary studies on the interplay between metaphor and religion; a selection of papers from the 25th LAUD-Symposium of the Gerhard Mercator University of Duisburg on 'Metaphor and Religion.'* Band 37. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Birdsall, J. Neville.
1992. 'A note on the textural evidence for the omission of Matthew 9:34.' Pages 117-22 in *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Birnbaum, Ellen.
1996. *The Place of Judaism in Philo's Thought: Israel, Jews, and Proselytes.* Brown Judaic Studies 290. Atlanta: Scholars.

Bishop, Eric F. F.
1955. *Jesus of Palestine: The Local Background to the Gospel Documents.* London: Lutterworth.

Black, Matthew.
1978. *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch: A New English Edition.* Leiden: Brill.

1983. 'The Role and Meaning of the "Son of God" Title in Matthew's Gospel.' *New Testament Studies* 33:532-556.

1986. 'The Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New.' *Scottish Journal of Theology.* 39: 1-17.

Black, Max.
1962. *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

1979. 'More About Metaphor.' Pages 19-43 in *Metaphor and Thought.* Edited by Andrew Ortony. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1979a. 'How Metaphors Work: A Reply to Donald Davidson.' Pages 181-192 in *On Metaphor.* Edited by Sheldon Sacks. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph.
1981. 'Interpretation and the Tendency to Sectarianism: An Aspect of Second Temple History.' Pages 1-26 in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition, Vol. II: Aspects of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman Period.* Edited by: E.P. Sanders. London: SCM.

1990. *Ezekiel* in *Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching*, edited by James Luther Mays. Louisville: John Knox.

Bloch, Renee.
1978. 'Midrash.' Pages 29-50 in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism: Theory and Practice.* Translated by Mary Howard Callaway. Edited by William Scott Green. Missoula: Scholars.

Blomberg, Craig L.
1997. *Jesus and the Gospels.* Nashville: Broadman & Holman.

Boccaccini, Gabriele.
1997. *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Bock, Darrell L.
2002. *Jesus According to Scripture: Restoring the Portrait from the Gospels.* Grand Rapids: Baker.

Bockmuehl, Markus.
2000. *Jewish Law in Gentile Churches: Halakhah and the Beginning of Christian Public Ethics.* Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Bockmuehl, Markus and Donald A. Hagner.
2005. *The Written Gospel.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Boeve, Lieven and Kurt Feyaerts, eds.
1999. *Metaphor and God-talk.* Vol. 2 of *Religions and Discourse.* Edited by James Francis. New York: Peter Lang.

1999a. 'Introduction.' Pages 7-14 in *Metaphor and God-talk.* Vol. 2 of *Religions and Discourse.* Edited by James Francis. New York: Peter Lang.

1999b. 'Religious Metaphors in a Postmodern Culture: Transverse Links Between Apophatical Theology and Cognitive Semantics.' Pages 153-185 in *Metaphor and God-talk.* Vol. 2 of *Religions and Discourse.* Edited by James Francis. New York: Peter Lang.

Bonhoeffer, Dietrich.
2001. *Discipleship: Dietrich Bonhoeffer Works, Volume 4.* Minneapolis: Fortress.

Borgeaud, Philippe.
1987. *The Cult Pan in Ancient Greece.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Borgen, Peder.
1984. 'Philo of Alexandria.' Pages 233-282 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period.* Edited by Michael E. Stone. Philadelphia: Fortress.

1992. 'Philo of Alexandria.' Pages 333-42 in vol. 5 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary.* Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday.

1992b. '"There Shall come Forth a Man" Reflection on Messianic Ideas in Philo.' Pages 341-61 in *The Messiah.* Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress.

1998. *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for his Time.* Leiden: Brill.

Borgen, Peder, Kare Fuglseth, and Roald Skarsten.
2000. *The Philo Index: A Complete Greek Word Index to the Writings of Philo of Alexandria.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Boring, Eugene M.
1995. *The Gospel of Matthew: The New Interpreter's Bible 8.* Nashville: Abingdon.

Bornkamm, Gunther.
1963. 'End-Expectation and Church in Matthew.' Pages 15-51 in *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew.* Translated by P. Scott. Edited by G. Bornkamm, G. Barth, and H.J. Held. Philadelphia: Westminster.

1995. 'The Authority to "Bind" and "Loose" in the Church in Matthew's Gospel.' Pages 101-14 in *The Interpretation of Matthew.* Edited by G.N. Stanton. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Bornkamm, Gunther, Gerhard Barth, and Heinz Joachim Held, eds.
1976. *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew.* Philadelphia: Westminster.

Bosetti, Elena.
1993. *YAHWEH: Shepherd of the People.* Middlegreen: St. Pauls.

Botterweck, Gerhard Johannes.
1960. Hurt und Herde im Alten Testament und im Alten Orient.' Pages 339-352 in *Die Kirche und ihre Amter und Stande: Festgabe seiner Eminenz demhochwuerdigsten Herrn Joseph Kardinal Frings Erzbischof von Koeln zum goldened Priesterjubilaeum am 10. August 1960 dargeboten.* Kolh.

Bower, E.
1928. 'The Shepherd's Two Rods in Modern Palestine and in Some Passages of the Old Testament.' *Biblica* 9: 434-42.

Brettler, Marc Zvi.
1989. *God is King: Understanding an Israelite Metaphor.* JSNTSup 76. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Brewer, David Instone.
1992. *Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis before 70 CE.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

2004. *Traditions of the Rabbis from the Era of the New Testament: Volume 1: Prayer and Agriculture.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Bright, John.
1965. *Jeremiah.* The Anchor Bible. Garden City: Doubleday.

2000. *A History of Israel, Fourth Edition.* With an Introduction and Appendix by William P. Brown. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Brooke, George J.
1985. *Exegesis at Qumran: 4Q Florilegium in its Jewish Context.* JSOT Sup 29. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Brooks, S.H.
1987. *Matthew's Community: The Evidence of his Special Sayings Material.* Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 16. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Broshi, Magen ed.
1992. *The Damascus Document Reconsidered.* Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society.

Broshi, Magen and Hanan Eshel.
2000. 'Daily life at Qumran.' *Near Eastern Archaeology* 63/3:136-37.

1991-92. The Messiah of Aaron in the *Damascus Document' Revue de Qumran* 15:215-30.

Brown, Frank Burch.
1984. *Transfiguration: Poetic Metaphor and the Languages of Religious Beliefs.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

Brown, Raymond E.
1975. 'The meaning of the Magi: The Significance of the Star.' *Worship* 49:574-82.

1977. *The Birth of the Messiah.* First Edition. New York: Doubleday.

1983. 'Not Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity, but Types of Jewish/Gentile Christianity.' *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 45: 74-9.

1984. *The Churches The Apostles Left Behind.* New York: Paulist.

1988. *The Birth of the Messiah: New Updated Edition.* New York: Doubleday.

1994. *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave.* 2 vols. New York: Doubleday.

Brown, Raymond E. and John P. Meier.

1983. *Antioch & Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity.* New York: Paulist.

Brown, Schuyler.

1977. 'The Two-Fold Representation of the Mission in Matthew's Gospel.' *Studia theologica* 69: 73-90.

1978. 'The Mission to Israel in Matthew's Central Section: Matthew 9:35-11:1.' *Aeitschrift fur die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der alteren Kirche* 69:73-90.

1980. 'The Matthean Community & the Gentile Mission.' *Novum Testamentum* 22: 193-221.

Broyles, Craig C.

1997. 'The Redeeming King: Psalm 72's Contribution to the Messianic Ideal' Pages 23-40 in *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Edited by Craig A. Evans and Peter W. Flint. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

1999. *Psalms: New International Biblical Commentary.* Peabody: Hendrickson.

Bruce, F. F.

1968. *New Testament Development of Old Testament Themes.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Brueggemann, Walter.

1990. *First and Second Samuel* in *Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching.* Louisville: John Knox.

1997. *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy.* Minneapolis: Fortress.

Bruner, Frederick Dale.

2004. Vol 1. *Matthew: The Christbook, Matthew 1-12. Revised and Expanded.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

2004a. Vol 2. *Matthew: The Churchbook, Matthew 13-28. Revised and Expanded.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Brunet, G.
1981. 'Jérémie et les Qînôt de son adversaire' Pages 74-79 in *Le Livre de Jérémie*. Edited by P.-M. Bogaert. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Buber, Martin.
1946. *Moses: The Revelation and the Covenant.* Atlantic Highlands: Humanities.

Burford, Alison.
2005. *Land and Labor in the Greek World.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Burridge, Richard A.
1991. *What are the Gospels*? Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1994. *Four Gospels, One Jesus*? Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Byrskog, Samuel.
1994. *Jesus the Only Teacher: Didactic Authority and Transmission in Ancient Israel, Ancient Judaism and the Matthean Community. Coniectanea Biblica: New Testament Series 24.* Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Cachia, Nicholas.
1997. *'I am the good shepherd. The good shepherd lays down his life for the sheep.' (John 10,11): The Image of the Good Shepherd as a Source for the Spirituality of the Ministerial Priesthood.* Rome: Gregorian University Press.

Caird, G.B.
1980. *The Language and Imagery of the Bible*. Cambridge: Eerdmans.

1994. *New Testament Theology.* Oxford: Clarendon.

1997. *The Language and Imagery of the Bible: With a New Introduction by N. T. Wright.* Cambridge: Eerdmans.

Callagahan, Denise Marie.
1997. 'The Temptation of Jesus.' *Spiritual Life* 1/230-35.

Campbell, Cynthia M.
1992. 'Matthew 28:16-20.' *Interpretation* 46:402-405.

Campbell, J.K.
1964. *Honour, Family and Patronage*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Carlston, C.E.
1991. 'Betz on the Sermon on the Mount: A Critique.' *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 50:47-57.

Carroll, Robert P.
1986. *Jeremiah: A Commentary*. Philadelphia: Westminster.

Carson, D.A. and H.G.M. Williamson, eds.
1987. *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honor of Barnabas Lindars*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carter, Warren.
1997. 'Mt. 4:18-22 and Mt. Discipleship: An Audience-Oriented Perspective.' *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 59/1:58-75.

2000 *Matthew and the Margins: A Sociopolitical and Religious Reading*. New York: Orbis.

2001. *Matthew and Empire: Initial Explorations*. Pennsylvania: Trinity.

2001a. 'Jesus' "I have Come" statements in Matthew's Gospel.' *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 60/1:44-62.

Charette, Blaine.
1990. 'A Harvest for the People: An Interpretation of Matthew 9:37f.' *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 38:29-35.

1992. *The Theme of Recompense in Matthew's Gospel*. JSNTSup 79. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

1992a. '"To Proclaim Liberty to the Captives": Matthew 11:28-30 in the Light of Old Testament Prophetic Expectation.' *New Testament Studies* 38:290-97.

2000. *Restoring Presence. The Spirit in Matthew's Gospel*. JPTSup 18. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Charles, R.H.
1998. *The Book of Enoch*. Escondido: The Book Tree.

Charlesworth, James H.
1985. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha & The New Testament: Prolegomena for the Study of Christian Origins*. Harrisburg: Trinity

1988. *Jesus Within Judaism*. New York: Doubleday.

1992. 'Book of 2 (Syriac) Baruch'. *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Volume 1: 620-621.

2000. 'Community Organization in the Rule of the Community.' Page 135 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Charlesworth, James H. ed.

1983-85.*The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: 2 Vols. Apocalyptic Literature & Testaments. Expansions of the 'Old Testament' & Legends, Wisdom & Philosophic Literature, Prayers, Psalms & Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works.* NY:Doubleday.

1992. *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls.* ABRL. New York: Doubleday.

Charlesworth, J.H. and J.A. Sanders.

1985. 'More Psalms of David.' Pages 609-616 in *Vol. 2 of The Old Testament Psedepigrapha:* Edited by James H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday.

Chazon, Esther.

1997. 'Hymns and Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls' in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years.* Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. Vanderkam. Leiden: Brill.

1998. 'Words of the Lumainaries.' Pages 989-990 in *Volume 2 of Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

1999. 'Psalms, Hymns, and Prayers.' Pages 710-715 in Volumn 2 of *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chester, Andrew.

1989. 'Citing the Old Testament.' Pages 141-69 in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture.* Edited by D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chilton, Bruce.

1982. *A Galilean Rabbi and His Bible: Jesus' Use of the Interpreted Scripture of His Time.* Wilmington: Glazier.

1993. 'Jesus and the Question of Anti-Semitism.' Pages 39-46 in *Anti-Semitism and Early Christianity: Issues of Polemic and Faith.* Edited by Craig A. Evans and Donald A. Hagner. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Chilton, Bruce and Craig A. Evans, eds.

1999. *Authenticating the Activities of Jesus.* Leiden: Brill.

Clay, Diskin.

1979. 'Socrates' Prayer to Pan.' Pages 345-353 in *Arktourous: Hellenic Studies presented to Bernard M.W. Knox.* Edited by G. Bowersock, W. Burkert and M. Putnam. New York: Putnam.

Clements, R. E.
1988. *Jeremiah.* Interpretation. Louisville: John Knox.

Coats, G. W.
1988. *Moses: Heroic Man, Man of God.* JSOTS 57. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.

1992. *The Moses Tradition.* JSOTS 161. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.

Cohen, Shaye J.D.
1987. *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah.* Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

1989. 'Crossing the Boundary and Becoming a Jew.' *Harvard Theological Review* 82: 13-33.

Collins, Adela Yarbor.
1999. 'Apocalyptic Themes in Biblical Literature.' *Interpretation* 53/2:117-30. Collins, Clifford John.

Collins, John J.
1995. 'Death will be their Shepherd.' *The Bible Translator* 46/3:320-26.

2000. *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora.* 2nd edition. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

2002. *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature.* New York: Doubleday.

Collins, John J. ed.
2000. *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism: Vol 1.* London: Continuum.

Collins, John J. and Craig A. Evans, ed.
2006. *Christian Beginnings and the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Collins, John J. and Robert A. Kugler, eds.
2000. *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Combs, Isobel H.
1997. 'Nursing Mother, Ancient Shepherd, Athletic Coach?' Pages 115-25 in *Images of Christ: Ancient and Modern.* Edited by: Stanley E. Porter et al. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Congdon, Roger D.
1978. 'Did Jesus Sustain the Law in Matthew 5?' *Bibliotheca Sacra* 135/2:117-125.

Cook, Stephen L.
1993. 'Metamorphosis of a shepherd; traditional history of Zech 11:17 & 13:7-9.' *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 55:453-466.

Cooper, David E.
1986. *Metaphor: Aristotelian Society Series: Volume 5.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Cope, O. Lamar.
1976. *Matthew: A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom of Heaven.* Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 5. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America.

Corney, Richard W.
1998. 'Rod and Staff: A Double Image?' Pages 28-41 in *On the Way to Ninevah: Studies in Honor of George M. Landers.* Edited by Stephen L. Cook and S.C. Winter. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Corwin, V.
1960. *St. Ingatius and Christianity in Antioch.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Cotterell, Peter and Max Turner.
1989. *Linguistics & Biblical Interpretation.* Downers Grove: InterVarsity.

Cousland, J.R.C.
2002. *The Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew.* NovTSup 102. Leiden: Brill.

Cragham, J.F.
1972. 'Ezekiel: A Pastoral Theologian.' *The American Ecclesiastical Review* 166: 22-33.

Craigie, P.C.
1982. 'Amos the "*noqed*" in the light of Ugaritic.' *Studies in Religion* 11: 29-33.

1982a. Psalms 1-50. Vol. 19. *Word Biblical Commentary.* Edited by Bruce M. Metzger, David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker. Nashville: Thomas Nelson.

Craigie, Peter C. and Kelley, Page H. and Drinkard, Joel F. Jr.
1991. Jeremiah 1-25. Vol. 16. *Word Biblical Commentary.* Edited by Bruce M. Metzger, David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker. Nashville: Thomas Nelson.

Croft, Joseph E.
1973. 'Pastoral Elements in the Iliad and Odyssey.' Ph.D. diss., Princeton University.

Cross, F.M.
1978. 'David, Orpheus, and Psalm 151:3-4.' *Bulletin of the American Schools of Research* 231: 69-71.

Cross, Frank Moore Jr. and Freedman, David Noel.
1975. *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry.* Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans.

Crowe, Jerome.
1997. *From Jerusalem to Antioch.* Collegeville: The Liturgical.

Culbertson, Philip L. and Arthur Bradford, eds.
1989. *The Pastor: Readings From The Patristic Period.* Minneapolis: Fortress.

Culpepper, Alan.
1984. 'Story and History in the Gospels.' *Review and Expositor* 81: 467-77.

Dalman, Gustaf.
1964. *Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina VI.* Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung.

Daube, David.
1980. 'Typology in Josephus.' *Journal of Jewish Studies* 31:18-36.

Davidson, Donald.
1979. 'What Metaphors Mean.' Pages 29-46 in *On Metaphor.* Edited by Sheldon Sacks. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Davidson, Robert.
1998. *The Vitality of Worship.* Edinburgh: Handsel.

Davies, Margaret.
1993. *Matthew.* Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Davies, Philip R.
1983. *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the Damascus Document.* Sheffield: JSOT Press.

2002. *The Complete World of The Dead Sea Scrolls.* New York: Thames & Hudson.

Davies, W. D.
1964. *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davies, W.D. and Dale C. Allison.
1988. Vol. 1.
1991. Vol. 2.
1997. Vol. 3. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Gospel According to Saint Matthew.* 3 vols. The International Critical Commentary Series. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

de Conick, April D.
1990. 'The Yoke Saying in the Gospel of Thomas 90.' *Vigilae christianea* 44:280-94.

de Pater, Wim A.
1999. 'Analogy and disclosures: On religious language.' Pages 15-32 in *Metaphor and God-talk.* Edited by L. Boeve and K. Feyaerts. Vol. 2 of *Religions and Discourse.* Edited by James Francis. New York: Peter Lang.

Deddo, G.W.
1996. 'Jesus' Paradigm for Relating Human Experience and Language about God.' *Evangelical Quarterly* 68/1:15-33.

Dell, Katherine J.
1999. 'The King in the Wisdom Literature' Pages 63-186 in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testmament Seminar.* Edited by John Day. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 270 Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

DeSilva, David A.
2000. *Honor, Patronage, Kinship & Purity: Unlocking New Testament Culture.* Downers Grove: InterVarsity.

Deutsch, Celia M.
1987. *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke: Wisdom, Torah and Discipleship in Matthew 11:25-30.* JSNTSup 18. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

1990. 'Wisdom in Matthew: Transformation of a Symbol.' *Novum Testamentum* 32:13-47.

1996. *Lady Wisdom, Jesus, and the Sages.* Valley Forge: Trinity.

2001. 'Jesus as Wisdom: A Feminist Reading of Matthew's Wisdom Christology.' Pages 88-113 in *A Feminist Companion of Matthew.* Edited by Amy-Jill Levine. Cleveland: Pilgrim.

Dimant, Devorah.
1984. 'Qumran Sectarian Literature.' Pages 483-550 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period.* Edited by Michael E. Stone. Philadelphia: Fortress.

1988. 'Use and Interpretation of Mikra in the Apocrapha and Pseudepigrapha.' Pages 379-419 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity. Compedia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, II 1.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

Dodd, C. H.
1952. *According to the Scriptures*. London: Fontana.

Donahue, John R.
1990. *The Gospel in Parable*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Donaldson, Terence L.
1985. *Jesus on the Mountain: A Study of Matthean Theology*. JSNTSup 8. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

1995. 'The Law that Hangs (Matthew 22:40): Rabbinic Formulation and Matthean Social World.' *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 57:689-709.

2005. 'The Vindicated Son: A Narrative Approach to Matthean Christology'. Pages 100-121 in *Contours of Christology in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Donfried, K.P.
1974. 'The Allegory of the Ten Virgins as a Summary of Matthean Theology.' *Journal of Biblical Literature* 93:415-28.

Donnelly, Doris ed.
2001. *Jesus: A Colloquium in the Holy Land*. New York: Continuum.

Doyle, Brian Roderick.
1983. 'Matthew's Wisdom: A Redaction-Critical Study of Matthew 11:1-14:3a.' Ph.D. diss. University of Melbourne, Australia. [Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1997]

Duguid, Iain.
1995. 'Messianic Themes in Zechariah 9-14.' Pages 265-80 in *The Lord's Anointed: Interpretation of Old Testament Messianic Texts*. Edited by Philip E. Satterthwaite, Richard S. Hess, and Gordon J. Wenham. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Duling, Dennis C.
1993. 'Matthew and Marginality.' Pages 642-71 in *Society of Biblical Literature*. Atlanta: Scholars.

1995. 'The Matthean Brotherhood and Marginal Scribal Leadership.' Pages 159-82 in *Modeling early Christianity: Social-scientific studies of the New Testament in its context*. Edited by: P.F. Esler. London: Routledge.

Dulles, Avery.
1995. *The Craft of Theology: From Symbol to System*. Rev. ed. New York: Herder & Herder.

Dungan, David Laird.
1999. *A History of the Synoptic Problem*. New York: Doubleday.

Dunn, James D.G.

1975. *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Westminster.

1980. *Christology in the Making*. London: SPCK.

1985. *The Evidence for Jesus*. Louisville: Westminster.

1990. *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: Second Edition*. Valley Forge: Trinity.

1992. *Jesus' Call to Discipleship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1992a. 'The Question of Anti-semitism in the New Testament Writings of the Period.' Pages 177-212 in *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

1998. *The Christ and The Spirit: Vol. 1 Christology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

1998a. *The Christ and The Spirit: Vol. 2 Pneumatology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans

2001. 'Jesus in Oral Memory: The Initial Stages of the Jesus Tradition.' Pages 84-145 in *Jesus: A Colloquium in the Holy Land*. Edited by Doris Donnelly. New York: Continuum.

2003 *Christianity in the Making. Vol 1: Jesus Remembered*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

2005. 'Q[1] as oral tradition.' Pages 45-69 in *The Written Gospel*. Edited by Markus Bockmuehl and Donald A. Hagner. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

2005a. *A New Perspective on Jesus: What the Quest for the Historical Jesus Missed*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Dunn, James D.G. ed.

1999. *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Edin, M.H.

2003. 'Learning What Righteousness Means.' *Word and World* 18/4:355-63.

Eichrodt, Walther.

1961. *Theology of the Old Testament*. Vols. 1-2. Philadelphia: Westminster.

Elliott, John H.
1993. *What is Social-Scientific Criticism?* Minneapolis: Fortress.

Ellis, E. Earle.
1991. *The Old Testament in Early Christianity: Cannon and Interpretation in the Light of Modern Research.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Ellis, Peter F.
1974. *Matthew: His Mind and His Message.* Collegeville: Liturgical.

Enslin, Morton S.
1991. *The Book of Judith: Greek Text with an English Translation, Commentary and Critical Notes.* Edited by Solomon Zeitlin. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Erickson, R.J.
1996. 'Divine Injustice?' Matthew's Narrative Strategy and the Slaughter of the Innocents (Matthew 2.13-23)" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 64:5-27.

Esler, Philip F. ed.
1995. *Modeling Early Christianity.* New York: Routledge.

Esler, P.F.
1996. 'Group Boundaries and Intergroup Conflict in Galatians: A New Reading of Gal. 5:13-6:10.' Pages 215-40 in *Ethnicity and the Bible.* Edited by: M.G. Brett. Leiden: Brill.

1998. 'Community and Gospel in Early Christianity: A Response to Richard Bauckham's Gospel for All Christians.' *Scottish Journal of Theology* 51: 235-248.

2003. 'The Character of Early Christianity in Rome.' Pages 19-42 in *Prayer and Spirituality in the Early Church. Vol. 3: Liturgy and Life.* Edited by Bronwen Neil, Geoffrey D. Dunn and Lawrence Cross. Strathfield, Australia: St. Pauls.

Evans, Craig A.
1992. *Noncanonical Writings and New Testament Interpretation.* Peabody: Hendrickson.

1993. 'Faith and Polemic: The New Testament and First-century Judaism.' Pages 1-17 in
Anti-Semitism and Early Christianity: Issues of Polemic and Faith.
Edited by Craig A. Evans and Donald A. Hagner. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

1999. 'Messiahs.' 537-542 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Vol. 1. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

2004. 'The Old Testament in the New.' Pages 130-145 in *The Face of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research.* Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

2005. *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: A Guide to the Background Literature.* Peabody: Hendrickson.

Evans, Craig A. ed.
2004. *From Prophecy to Testament: The Function of the Old Testament in the New.* Peabody: Hendrickson.

Evans, Craig A. and Donald A. Hagner, eds.
1993. *Anti-Semitism and Early Christianity: Issues of Polemic and Faith.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Evans, Craig A. and James A. Sanders, eds.
1997. *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals.* Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity 5. JSNTSup 148. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Falk, D.
1998. *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayer in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 27.* Leiden: Brill.

Farmer, William R.
1972. *Jesus and the Gospel.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

Feldman, Louis H.
1992. 'Josephus.' Pages 981-998 in vol. 3 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary.* Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday.

1993. *Jew & Gentile in the Ancient World.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

2005. 'Josephus: Interpretive Methods and Tendencies.' Pages 590-96 in *Dictionary of New Testament Background.* Edited by Craig Evans and Stanley Porter. Downers Grove: InterVarsity.

Fenton, J. C.
1959. 'Inclusio and Chiasmus in Matthew'. Pages 174-179 in *Studia Evangelica I.* Edited by F. L. Cross. *Texte und Untersuchungen 73.* Berlin: Topelmann.

1964. *Saint Matthew.* Pelican Commentaries. Baltimore: Penguin.

Feyaerts, Kurt ed.
2002. *The Bible through Metaphor and Translation: A Cognitive Semantic Perspective.* Vol. 15 in *Religions and Discourse* Edited by James M. M. Francis. New York: Peter Lang.

Fiedler, Peter.
1969. *Die Formel: Und Siehe, Im Neuen Testament.* Munchen: Kosel-Verlag

Filson, F. V.
1960. *A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew.* Black's New Testament Commentary. London: A&C Black.

Finkelstein, J.J.
1968. 'An Old Babylonian Herding Contract and Genesis 31:38.' *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 88:30-36.

Finley, Thomas J.
1982. 'Sheep Merchants of Zech 11.' *Grace Theological Journal* 3: 51-65.

Fishbane, M.
1985. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A.
1957. '"4QTESTIMONIA" and the New Testament' *Theological Studies* 18:513-537. Repr. pages 59-89 in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament.* London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1971.

1960-61.'The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament.' *New Testament Studies* 7:297-333. Repr. pages 3-58 in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament.* London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1971.

1971. *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament.* London: Geoffrey Chapman.

Flint, Peter.
1996. 'Of Psalms and Psalters: James Sanders's Investigation of the Psalms Scrolls.' Pages 65-83 in *A Gift of God in Due Season.* Edited by Richard D.Weis and David M. Carr. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

1997. *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms.* New York: Brill.

2000. 'The Contribution of the Dead Sea Biblical Scrolls to Biblical Studies, with the Preliminary Editions of 4QPs^{p} and 4QPs$^{r\text{-}u}$.' *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 83:3-17.

Flusser, David.
1972. 'Seventy Shepherds, Vision of.' *Encyclopedia Judaica* vol. 14, Red-Sl. Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House.

1984. 'Psalms, Hymns and Prayers.' Pages 551-77 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period.* Edited by Michael E. Stone. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Ford, David F. and Graham Stanton, eds.
2003. *Reading Texts, Seeking Wisdom: Scripture and Theology.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Foulkes, F.
1994. 'The Acts of God: A Study of the Basis of Typology in the Old Testament.' Pages 342-371 in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Text? Essays in the Use of the Old Testament in the New.* Edited by G. K. Beal. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

France, R. T.
1971. *Jesus and the Old Testament.* Downers Grove: InterVarsity.

1975. *I Came To Set The Earth On Fire: A Portrait of Jesus.* Downers Grove: InterVarsity.

1980. 'The Formula-Quotations of Matthew 2 and the Problem of Communication.' *New Testament Studies* 27:233-51.

1985. *Matthew.* Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Downers Grove: InterVarsity.

1989. *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher.* Downers Grove: InterVarsity.

2001. *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text.* NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

France, R.T. and David Wenham, eds.
1983. *Gospel Perspectives. III. Studies in Midrash and Historiography.* Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Freedman, David Noel.
1975. 'Early Israelite History in the Light of Early Israelite Poetry.' Pages 3-35 in *Unity and Diversity. Essays in the History, Literature, and Religion of the Ancient Near East.* Edited by Hans Goedicke and J.J.M. Roberts. London: Johns Hopkins University Press.

1976. 'The Twenty-Third Psalm.' Pages 139-166 in *Michigan Oriental Studies in Honor of George G. Cameron.* Edited by Louis L. Orlin. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

1976a. 'Divine Names and Title in Early Hebrew Poetry.' Pages 55-107 in *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God.* Edited by F.M. Cross. New York: Doubleday.

1980. *Pottery, Poetry, and Prophecy: Studies in Early Hebrew Poetry.* Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Freyne, Sean.
1985. 'Vilifying the Other and Defining the Self: Matthew's and John's Anti-Jewish Polemic in Focus.' Pages 117-43 in *'To See Ourselves as Others See Us': Christians, Jews, 'Others' in Late Antiquity.* Edited by Jacob Neusner and Ernest Frerichs. Chico: Scholars.

Gabriel, KJ.
1996. 'Jesus' economic perspective as presented in Matthew.' *Biblebhashyam* 22/4:200-09.

Galaty, John G. and Douglas L. Johnson, eds.
1991. *The World of Pastoralism: Herding Systems in Comparative Perspective.* New York: Guilford.

Galaty, John G. and Douglas L. Johnson.
1991. 'Introduction: Pastoral Systems in Global Perspective.' Pages 1-31 in *The World of Pastoralism: Herding Systems in Comparative Perspective.* New York: Guilford.

Garcia Martines, Florentino and Julio Trebolle Barrera.
1995. *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices.* Translated by Wilfred G.E. Watson. New York: Brill.

Garland, David E.
1979. *The Intention of Matthew 23.* Leiden: Brill.

2001. *Reading Matthew: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the First Gospel.* Macon: Smyth & Helwys.

Gärtner, Bertil Edgar.
1954. 'The Habakkuk Commentary (DHS) and the Gospel of Matthew.' *Studia Theologica* 8/1:1-24.

Gaston, L.
1985. 'Judaism of the Uncircumcised in Ignatius and Related Writers.' Pages 33-44 in *Anti Judaism in Early Christianity, Vol. II.* Edited by S.G. Wilson. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier.

Gench, Frances Taylor.
1997. *Wisdom in the Christology of Matthew.* Lanham: University Press of America.

Gerhardsson, Birger.
1979. *The Mighty Acts of Jesus according to Matthew*. Lund: CWK Gleerup.

1979a. *The Origins of the Gospel Traditions*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

1986. *The Gospel Tradition*. Malmo: CWK Gleerup.

1998. *Memory and Manuscript*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

1999. 'The Christology of Matthew.' Pages 14-32 in *Who Do You Say That I Am: Essays on Christology*. Edited by Mark Allan Powell and David R. Bauer. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Gerhart, Mary and Allan Russell.
1987. *Metaphoric Process*. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press.

1990. 'The Cognitive Effect of Metaphor.' *Listening* 25:114-26.

Gevirtz, Stanley.
1984. 'Nephtali in "The Blessing of Jacob."' *Journal of Biblical Literature* 103: 513-521.

Gibbs, J.M.
1968. 'The Son of God as Torah Incarnate in Matthew.' *Studia Evangelica 4/TU 102:38-46.*

Gluck, J.J.
1963. 'Nagid-Shepherd.' *Vetus Testamentum* 13:144-50.

Gnilka, Joachim.
1988. *Das Matthaus-evangelium*. Freiburg: Herder.

Goldstein, Jonathan A.
1976. *I Maccabees: A New Translation with Introductiaon and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday.

Goppelt, L.
1972. 'τύπος' Pages 246-259 in vol. VIII of *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated and Edited by G. Kittle and F. Friedreich.Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Goulder, M.D.
1974. *Midrash and Lection in Matthew*. London: SPCK.

Gray, Sherman W.
1989. *The Least of My Brothers: Matthew 25:31-46: A History of Interpretation*. SBLDS. Atlanta: Scholars.

Green, Joel B. ed.
1995. *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Greenberg, Moshe.
1997. *Ezekiel 21-37.* The Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday.

Greer, Rowan A.
1999. 'The Good Shepherd: Canonical Interpretations in the Early Church?' Pages 306-30 in *Theological Exegesis: Essays in Honor of Brevard S. Childs.* Edited by Christopher Seitz and Kathryn Greene-McCreight. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Grunfeld, Joseph.
1992. 'Kittay's Theory of Metaphor.' *Science et Esprit.* 44/1: 83-89.

Gundry, Robert H.
1967. *The Use of the Old Testament in Matthew's Gospel: With Special Reference to the Messianic Hope.* NovTSup 18. Leiden: Brill.

1991. 'A Responsive Evaluation of the Social History of the Matthean Community in Roman Syria.' Pages 62-67 in *Social History of the Matthean Community.* Edited by Balch. Minneapolis: Fortress.

1994. *Matthew: A Commentary on his Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution.* 2nd edition. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

1994/5. 'But is It Matthew?' *Cross Currents* 44/4:508-11.

Gutzwiller, Kathryn J.
1991. *Theocritus' Pastoral Analogies: The Formation of a Genre.* Madison: U. of Wis. Press.

Hagner, Donald A.
1992. 'Righteousness in Matthew's Theology.' Pages 101-120 in *Worship, Theology and Ministry in the Early Church: Essays in Honor of Ralph P. Martin.* Edited by Michael J. Wilkins and Terence Paige. JSNTSup 87. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

1993. Vol. 1.
1995. Vol. 2. *World Biblical Commentary: Matthew.* 2 vols. Dallas: Word.

1996. 'The *Sitz im Leben* of the Gospel of Matthew.' Pages 27-68 in *Treasures New and Old. Recent Contributions to Matthean Studies.* Edited by D. R. Bauer and M. A. Powell. SBL Symposium 1. Atlanta: Scholars.

1997. 'Balancing the Old and the New. The Law of Moses in Matthew and Paul.' *Interpretation* 51/1:20-30.

1998. 'Law, Righteousness and Discipleship in Matthew.' *Word and World* 18/4:364-71.

1998a. 'New things from the Scribes' treasure box.' *The Expository Times* 109/11:329-34.

2004. 'Matthew: Christian Judaism or Jewish Christianity?' Pages 263-282 in *The Face of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research.* Edited by Scott McKnight and Grant R. Osborne.Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Hallo, William M.
1997. *The Context of Scripture: Vol 1.* Netherlands: Brill.

Ham, Clay Alan.
2005. *The Coming King and the Rejected Shepherd: Matthew's Reading of Zechariah's Messianic Hope.* Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix.

Hammond, N.G.L. and H.H. Sculland, eds.
1970. 'Pan.' Page 304 in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hanson, A. T.
1983. *The Living Utterances of God: The New Testament Exegesis of the Old.* London: Darton, Longman and Todd.

Hanson, K. C.
1994. 'How Honorable! How Shameful!' *Semeia* 68:81-111.

1994a. 'Transformed on the Mountain.' *Semeia* 67:147-70.

Haran, Menaham.
1988. 'The Two Text-Forms of Psalm 151.' *The Journal of Jewish Studies* 39:171-82.

Hare, Douglas R.A.
1967. *The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel According to St. Matthew.* SNTSMS 6. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1979. 'The Rejection of the Jews in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts.' Pages 27-47 in *Antisemitism & the Foundations of Christianity.* Edited by A. Davies. NY: Paulist.

1993. *Matthew* in *Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching.* Louisville: John Knox.

1998. 'Current Trends in Matthean Scholarship.' *Word and World* 18/4:405-410.

2000. 'How Jewish is the Gospel of Matthew?' *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 62/2:264-277.

Harrington, Daniel J.
1991. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Collegeville: Liturgical.

Harris, Rendel.
1916-1920. *Testimonies: I and II.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hartman, L.
1972. 'Scripture Exegesis in the Gospel of St. Matt. & the Problem of Communication. Pgs. 131-52 in *L'Evangile selon Matthieu. Redaction et theologie. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 29.* Edited by M. Didier. Gembloux: Duculot.

Hayes, John H. and Sara R. Mandell.
1998. *The Jewish People in Classical Antiquity*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Hays, Richard B.
1989. Echoes *of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

2006. 'The Canonical Matrix of the Gospels'in *The Cambridge Companion to the Gospels.* Edited by Stephen C. Barton. Cambridge: University Press.

Hays, Richard B. and Joel B. Green.
1995. 'The Use of the Old Testament by New Testament Writers'. Pages 222-238 in *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Heater, H.
1983. 'Matthew 2:6 and Its Old Testament Sources'. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society.* 26:395-397.

Hecht, Richard D.
1989. 'Philo and Messiah.' Pages 139-68 in *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*. Edited by Jacob Neusner, William S. Green, and Ernest Frericks. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heil, John Paul.
1979. 'Significant Aspects of the Healing Miracles in Matthew.' *The Catholic Bible Quarterly* 41/4:274-287.

1991. *The Death and Resurrection of Jesus: A Narrative-Critical Reading of Matthew 26-28*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

1993. 'Ezekiel 34 and the Narrative Strategy of the Shepherd and Sheep Metaphor in Matthew.' *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 55/4: 698-708.

1998. 'The Double Meaning of the Narrative of Universal Judgement in Matthew 25:31-46.' Pages 3-14 in *Journal for the Study of the New Testament 69.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Helyer, Larry R.
2002. *Exploring Jewish Literature of the Second Temple Period: A Guide for New Testament Students*. Illinois: InterVarsity.

Hempel, Charlotte.
2002. *The Damascus Text: Companion to the Qumran Scrolls, 1*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Hengel, Martin.
1973. *Victory over Violence: Jesus and the Revolutionists*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

1974. *Judaism and Hellenism: Volume One & Two*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

1976. *The Son of God*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

1977. *Crucifixion*. London: SCM.

1980. *Jews, Greeks and Barbarians*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

1981. *The Atonement: The Origins of the Doctrine in the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

1981a. *The Charismatic Leader and His Followers*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

1981b. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounters in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

1995. *Studies in Early Christology*. New York: Edinburgh.

2000. *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ*. Harrisburg: Trinity.

2005. 'Eye-witness memory and the writing of the Gospels.' Pages 70-96 in *The Written Gospel.* Edited by Markus Bockmuehl and Donald A. Hagner. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hengel, Martin and Anna Maria Schwemer.
1997. *Paul: Between Damascus and Antioch*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Hengel, Martin and H. Merkel.
1973. 'Die Magier aus dem Osten und die Flucht nach Agypten (Mt 2) im Rahmen der antiken Religionsgeschichte und der Theolgie des Matthaus.' Pages 139-169 in *Orientierung as Jesus.* FS Josef Schmid. Edited by P. Hoffmann. Freiburg: Herder.

Henle, Paul.
1981. 'Metaphor.' Pages 83-104 in *Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor.* Edited by Mark Johnson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Hezser, Catherine.
2001. *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine.* Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Hill, David.
1972. *The Gospel Of Matthew* in *The New Century Bible Commentary.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

1976. 'False Prophets and Charism: Structure and Interpretation in Matthew 7:15-23.' *Biblica* 57:327-348.

1977. 'On the Use and Meaning of Hosea V16 in Matthew's Gospel.' *New Testament Studies* 24:107-119.

1979. 'Jesus and Josephus' "Messianic Prophets."' Pages 143-54 in *Text and Interpretation.* Edited by Ernest Best and R. M. Wilson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1980. 'Son and Servant: An essay on Matthean Christology.' *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 6:2-16.

1984. 'The Figure of Jesus in Matthew's Story: A Response to Professor Kingsbury's Literary-Critical Probe.' *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 21:37-52.

1986. 'In Quest of Matthean Christology.' *Irish Biblical Studies* 9:135-42.

Hills, Julian V. ed.
1998. *Common Life in the Early Church: Essays Honoring Graydon F. Snyder.* Harrisburg: Trinity.

Horgan, Maurya P.
1979. 'Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books.' Pages 191-228 in *Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series.* Washington D.C.

Holladay, William L.
1984. 'The Background of Jeremiah's Self-Understanding; Moses, Samuel, and Psalm 22. Pages 313-324 in *A Prophet to the Nations: Essays in Jeremiah Studies.* Edited by Leo G. Perdue and Brian W. Kovacs. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

1986. *Jeremiah 1: Chapters 1-25.*

1989. *Jeremiah 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 26-52.* Hermeneia-A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Holm-Nielsen, S.
1960. *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran.* Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget.

Hopkins, C.
1993. 'Pastoralists in the Late Bronze Age Palestine'. *Biblical Archaeologist* 56:200-211.

Horsley, Richard A.
1985. '"Like One of the Prophets of Old": Two Types of Popular Prophets at the Time of Jesus.' *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 47:435-63.

1986. 'Popular Prophetic Movements at the Time of Jesus: Their Principal Features and Social Origins.' *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 26:3-27.

1991. *The Liberation of Christmas.* New York: Crossroad.
1995. *Galilee: History, Politics, People.* Valley Forge: Trinity.

2000. 'The Kingdom of God and the Renewal of Israel: Synoptic Gospels, Jesus Movements, and Apocalypticism.' Pages 303-344 in vol. 1 of *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity.* Edited by John J. Collins. 3 vols. London: Continuum.

Horsley, Richard A. and J.S. Hanson.
1980. *Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs: Popular Movements in the Time of Jesus.* Minneapolis: Winston-Seabury.

Howard, David M.
1999. 'Psalm 94 among the Kingship-of-Yhwh Psalms.' *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 61:667-85.

Howell, David B.
1990. *Matthew's Inclusive Story: A Study in the Narrative Rhetoric of the First Gospel.* JSNTSup 42. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Hubbard, Benjamin J.
1972. *The Matthean Redaction of a Primitive Apostolic Commissioning: An Exegesis Of Matthew 28:16-20.* Missoula: Scholars.

Hubbard, Thomas K.
1999. *The Pipes of Pan: Intertextualiity and Literary Filiation in the Pstoral Tradition from Theocrius to Milton.* Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Hübner, Hans.
1992. 'New Testament, OT Quotations in the.' Pages1096-1104 in vol. 4 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary.* Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday.

Hultgren, A. J.
2000. *The Parables of Jesus: A Commentary. The Bible in Its World* series edited by David Noel Freedman. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

2001. "Mission and Ministry in Matthew." *Word and World 18/4:341-47.*

Humphries-Brooks, Stephenson.
2001. 'The Canaanite Women in Matthew.' Pages 138-156 in *A Feminist Companion of Matthew.* Cleveland: Pilgrim.

Hunter, Archibald M.
1961. *Paul and his Predecessors.* London: SCM.

1965. *A Pattern for Life: An Exposition of The Sermon on the Mount.* Philadelphia: Westminster.

Huntzinger, J. D.
1999. 'The End of the Exile. A Short Commentary on the Shepherd/Sheep Metaphor in Exilic and Postexilic Prophetic and Synoptic Gospel Literature.' Ph.D. diss./thesis, Fuller Theological Seminary.

Hurtado, Larry W.
2006. *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Huseman, William H.
1999. 'The Sacred Centre of Orthodoxy: Metaphorical Links Between Sexual Impurity and Heresy.' Pages 233-252 in *Metaphor and God-talk.* Vol. 2 of *Religions and Discourse.* Edited by James Francis. New York: Peter Lang.

Instone-Brewer, David.
1992. *Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis before 70 CE.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

2004. *Traditions of the Rabbis from the Era of the New Testament: Volume 1: Prayer and Agriculture.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Isaac, E.
1983. *Enoch: A New Translation and Introduction.* Pages 5-89 of Volume 1. *The Old Testament Pseudepicgrapha.* Edited by James H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday.

Isager, Signe and Jens Erik Skydsgaard.
1992. *Ancient Greek Agriculture.* New York: Routledge.

Jeffers, James S.
1999. *The Greco-Roman World of the New Testament Era: Exploring the Background of Early Christianity.* Downers Grove: InterVarsity.

Jenni, Ernst and Clauss Westermann.
1997. *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament.* 3 vols. Peabody: Hendrickson.

Jenson, R. W.
1999. 'The Religious Power of Scripture.' *Scottish Journal of Theology* 52: 89-105.

Jeremias, Joachim.
1966. 'ποιμήν' Pages 485-502 in vol. VI of *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.* Translated and edited by G. Kittle and F. Friedreich. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

1967. *Jesus' Promise to the Nations.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

1969. *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

1971. *New Testament Theology.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

1972. *The Parables of Jesus.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Johnson, Aubrey R.
1970. 'Psalm 23 and the Household of Faith.' Pages 255-271 in *Proclamation and Presence.* Edited by John R. Durham and J.R. Porter. Richmond: John Knox.

Johnson, D. H.
1992. 'Shepherd, Sheep.' Pages 751-54 in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels.* Edited by Joel B. Green et al. Downers Grove: InterVarsity.

Johnson, Luke T.
1989. 'The New Testament's Anti-Jewish Slander and the Conventions of Ancient Polemic'. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108:419-41.

Johnson, Mark ed.
1981. *Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

1981a.'Introduction: Metaphor in the Philosophical Tradition.' Pages 3-47 in *Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Johnston, Robert K.
1982. 'Responding to Crisis.' *Crux* 18/3: 2-5.

Jonker, Louis.
2002. רעה Pages 1138-43 in vol. 3 of N*ew International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology & Exegesis.* 5 vols. Edited by Willem A. VanGemeren. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Juel, Donald.
1988. *Messianic Exegesis: Christological Interpretation of the Old Testament in Early Christianity.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

Jüngel, Eberhard.
1989. *Theological Essays I.* Edited and Translated with an Introduction by J. B. Webster. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Kaiser, Walter C.
1985. *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New.* Chicago: Moody.

1985a. 'Respecting the Old Testament Context: Matthew's Use of Hosea and Jeremiah—Hosea 11:1 and Jeremiah 31:15.' Pages 43-57 in *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New.* Edited by Walter C. Kaiser. Chicago: Moody.

1995. *The Messiah in the Old Testament,* in *Studies in Old Testament Biblical Theology.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Keck, Leander E.
1978. 'Oral Traditional Literature and the Gospels: The Seminar.' Pages 103-122 in *The Relationships Among the Gospels.* Edited by: William O. Walker, Jr. San Antonio: Trinity University Press.

Kee, Howard Clarck.
1989. *Knowing the Truth: A Sociological Approach to New Testament Interpretation.* Minneapolis: Fortress.

1992. 'Early Christianity in the Galilee: Reassessing the Evidence from the Gospels.' Pages 3-22 in *The Galilee in Late Antiquity.* Edited by: L.I. Levine. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Keener, Craig S.
1999. *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Kelber, Werner H.
1997. *The Oral and the Written Gospel.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Kimelman, R.
1981. 'Birkath-Ha-Minim and the Lack of Evidence for an Anti-Christian Jewish Prayer in Late Antiquity.' Pages 226-44 in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition, vol. II: Aspects of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman Period.* Edited by: E.P. Sanders. London: SCM.

Kingsbury, Jack D.
1975. *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

1981. *Jesus Christ in Matthew, Mark, and Luke.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

1983. 'Righteousness in Matthew and His World of Thought' *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 45:320-322.

1984. 'The Figure of Jesus in Matthew's Story: A Literary-Critical Probe.' *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 21:1-36.

1985. 'The Figure of Jesus in Matthew's Story: A Rejoinder to David Hill.' *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 25:61-81.

1987. 'The Developing Conflict between Jesus and the Jewish Leaders in Matthew's Gospel: A Literary-Critical Study.' *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 49:57-73.

1988. *Matthew as Story.* 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Fortress.

1992. 'The Plot of Matthew's Story.' *Interpretation* 46/4:347-56.

2001. 'The Birth Narrative of Matthew.' Pages 154-165 in *The Gospel of Matthew in Current Study.* Edited by David E. Aune. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Kittay, Eva Feder.
1987. *Metaphor: Its Cognitive Force and Linguistic Structure.* Oxford: Clarendon.

Kittel, B. P.
1981. *The Hymns of Qumran.* SBLDS 50. Chico: Scholars.

Klassen-Weibe, Sheila.
1992. Matthew 1:18-25. *Interpretation* 46/4:392-394.

Klein, Ralph W.
1987. 'Failed Kings and Their Counterparts.' *Ezekiel: The Prophet and His Message. Studies on Personalities of the Old Testament.* Edited by James L. Crenshaw. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.

1988. *Ezekiel: The Prophet and His Message.* Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.

Kloppenborg, John S.
1979. 'Didaceh 16:6-8 and Special Matthaean Tradition.' *Zeitschrift fur die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 70: 54-67.

1987. *The Formation of Q.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

1988. *Q Parallels: Synopsis, Critical Notes and Concordance.* Sonoma: Polebridge.

Kloppenborg, John S. ed.
1994. *The Shape of Q.* Minneapolis: Fortress.

Kloppenborg, John S. and Stephen G. Wilson, eds.
1996. *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World.* London: Routledge.

Kloppenborg, John S., James M. Robinson and Paul Hoffman, eds.
2000. *The Critical Edition of Q.* Minneapolis: Fortress.

Kloppenborg Verbin, J. S.
2000. *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel.* Minneapolis: Fortress.

Knibb, Michael A.
1987. *The Qumran Community.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1991. 'The Interpretation of *Damascus Document* VII, 9*b* – VIIII, 2*a* and XIX, 5*b* 14.' *Revue de Qumran* 15:243-51.

2000. 'Community Organization in the *Damascus Document*'. Pages 136-38. Vol. 1. *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Knight, William Allen.
1904. *The Song of Our Syrian Guest.* Cleveland: Pilgrim.

Knoblauch, Hebert.
1999. 'Metaphors, Transcendence and indirect Communication: Alfred Schutz' Phenomenology of the Life-world and the Metaphors of Religion.' Pages 75-94 in *Metaphor and God-talk.* Edited by L. Boeve and K Feyaerts. Vol. 2 of *Religions and Discourse.* Edited by James Francis. New York:

Peter Lang.

Knowles, Michael.
1993. *Jeremiah in Matthew's Gospel: The Rejected-Prophet Motif in Mattaean Redaction.* JSNTSup 68. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

2006. 'Scripture, History, Messiah: Scriptural Fulfillment and the Fullness of Time in Matthew's Gospel.' Pages 59-82 in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament.* Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Koester, Helmut.
1980. *History and Literature of Early Christianity.* New York: Walter De Gruyter.

1982. *History, Culture and Religion of the Hellenistic Age.* New York: Walter De Gruyter.

Köhler-Rollefson, Ilse U.
1990. 'Sheep.' Pages 937-938 in *Harpers Bible Dictionary.* Edited by Paul J. Achtemeier. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Kopfensteiner, Thomas R.
1997. 'The Metaphorical Structure of Normativity.' *Theological Studies* 58:331-46.

Korpel, Marjo Christina Annette.
1990. *A Rift in the Clouds: Ugaritic and Hebrew Descriptions of the Divine.* Munster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Kostenberger, Andreas J.
2002. 'Jesus the Good Shepherd Who Will Also Bring Other Sheep: The Old Testament Background of a Familiar Metaphor.' *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 12:67-96.

2006. 'Hearing the Old Testament in the New: A Response.' Pages 255-294 in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament.* Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Kovecses, Zoltan.
2002. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction.* New York: Oxford University Press. Kraeling, C.H.

1932. 'The Jewish Community at Antioch.' *Journal of Biblical Literature* 51:130-60.

Kraus, Hans-Joachim.
1988. *Psalms 1-59: A Continental Commentary.* Vol. 1. Minneapolis: Augsburg.

1992. *Psalms 60-150: A Continental Commentary.* Vol. 2. Minneapolis: Fortress.

1992. *Theology of the Psalms.* Minneapolis: Fortress.

Krentz, E.
1998. 'Identity Formation: Matthew as Resource and Guide.' *Word and World* 18/4:411-17.

Kugel, J. L. and R. A. Greer.
1975. *Early Biblical Interpretation.* Philadelphia: Westminster.

Kugler, Robert A. and Eileen M. Schuller.
1999. 'Part Three: Assessing the Cave 4 Fragments of the Damascus Document-Reflections on Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XVIII: 147-201. *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature*
Qumran Section Meetings. Atlanta: Scholars.

Kuhn, Thomas, S.
1979. 'Metaphor in Science.' Pages 409-419 in *Metaphor and Thought.* Edited by Andrew Ortony. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kuske, D.
1997. 'Meaning of "*Matheteusate*" in Matthew 28:19.' *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 94/2:115-121.

Kupp, D.D.
1998. *Matthew's Emmanuel: Divine Presence and God's People in the First Gospel.* SNTSMS 90. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lakoff, George.
1993. 'The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor.' Pages 202-251 in *Metaphor and Thought.* Edited by Andrew Ortony. 2nd Ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson.
1981. 'Conceptual Metaphor in Everyday Language.' Pages 286-328 in *Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

2003. *Metaphors We Live By.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lamberton, Robert.
2001. *Plutarch.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Lambrecht, J.
1988. *Out of the Treasure: The Parables in the Gospel of Matthew.* Louvain: Peeters.

Lampe, G. W. H. and K. L. Woollcombe, eds.
1957. *Essays on Typology* London: SCM.

1957a. 'The Reasonableness of Typology' Pages 9-38 in *Essays on Typology*, Edited by G. W. H. Lamp and K. J. Woollcomb. London: SCM.

Laniak, Timothy S.
2006. *Shepherds after my own heart: Pastoral Traditions and Leadership in the Bible.* New Studies in Biblical Studies 20. Ed. by D. A. Carson. Downers Grove: InterVarsity.

Legrand, L.
1990. 'Good Shepherd in the Gospel of Mark.' *Indian Theological Studies* 29:234-55.

Levine, Amy-Jill.
1988. *The Social and Ethnic Dimensions of Matthean Salvation History.* Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity. Vol. 14. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen.

2000. 'Matthew's Advice to a Divided Readership.' Pages 22-41 in *The Gospel of Matthew in Current Study.* Edited by David E. Aune. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Levine, Amy-Jill, ed. and Marianne Blickenstaff.
2004. *A Feminist Companion to Matthew.* Cleveland: The Pilgrim.

Levine, Lee I., ed.
1992. *The Galilee in Late Antiquity.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Levin, Samuel R.
1979. 'Standard Approaches to Metaphor and a Proposal for Literary Metaphor.' Pages 124-135 in *Metaphor and Thought.* Edited by Andrew Ortony. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lieu, J.
1992. 'History and Theology in Christian Views of Judaism.' Pages 79-96 in *The Jews among Pagans and Christians.* Edited by J. Lieu, J. North and T. Rajak. London: Routledge.

Lindemann, A. ed.
2001. *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium: CLVIII.* Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Lindars, Barnabas.
1961. *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations.* Philadelphia: Westminster.

1976. 'A Bull, A Lamb, and a WORD: I Enoch XC. 38.' *New Testament Studies* 22:483:86.

Lohmeyer, E.
1967. *Das Evangelium des Matthaus.* 4th ed., revised by W. Schmauch. Gottingen.

Lonergan. Bernard.
1990. *Method in Theology.* Reprint Ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Longnecker, Richard N.
1999. *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period. Second Edition* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Longenecker, Richard N. ed.
2005. *Contours of Christology in the New Testament.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Lord, Albert B.
1979. 'Oral Traditional Literature and the Gospels.' Pages 33-92 in *The Relationships Among the Gospels.* Edited by William O. Walker, Jr. San Antonio: Trinity University Press.

Louw, Johannes P. and Eugene A. Nida.
1989. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament based on Semantic Domains.* New York: United Bible Societies.

Ludemann, G.
1980. 'The Successors of Pre-70 Jerusalem Christianity: A Critical Evaluation of the Pella Tradition.' Pages 161-73 in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition, vol I: The Shaping of Christianity in the Second and Third Centuries."* London: SCM.

Lundbom, Jack.
1999. Vol. 21A. *Jeremiah 1-20.*
2004. Vol. 21B. *Jeremiah 21-36.*
2004. Vol. 21C. *Jeremiah 37-52: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary.* The Anchor Bible. 3 Vols. Edited by William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday.

Lust, Johan.
1981. ' "Gathering and Return" in Jeremiah and Ezekiel' Pages 119-142 in *Le Livre de Jérémie.* Edited by P.-M. Bogaert. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

1997. 'Mic 5,1-3 in Qumran and in the New Testament and Messianism in the Septuragint'. Pages 65-88 in *The Scriptures in the Gospels.* Edited by Christopher Tuckett. *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium: CXXXI.* Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Luz, Ulrich.
1995. *The Theology of the Gospel of Matthew*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1995a. 'The Disciples in the Gospel according to Matthew'. Pages 115-48 in *The Interpretation of Matthew*. Edited by: G.N. Stanton. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

1989. Vol. 1. *Matthew 1-7.*
2001. Vol. 2. *Matthew 8-20.*
2005. Vol 3. *Matthew 21-28.* Hermeneia-A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. 3 Vols. Minneapolis: Fortress.

2005a. *Studies in Matthew.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

MacCormac, Earl R.
1985. *A Cognitive Theory of Metaphor.* Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Macky, Peter W.
1990. *The Centrality of Metaphors to Biblical Thought: A Method for Interpreting the Bible.* Vol. 19 in *Studies in the Bible and early Christianity.* Lampeter: Edwin Mellen.

Maier, Robert.
1999. 'Religious Communication and Pragmatic Metaphors.' Pages 113-126 in *Metaphor and God-talk.* Edited by L. Boeve and K Feyaerts. Vol. 2 of *Religions and Discourse.* Edited by James Francis. New York: Peter Lang.

Malina, Bruce J.
1991. 'Jewish Christianity or Christian Judaism: Toward a Hypothetical Definition.' *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods* 7:46-57.

2000. *The Social Gospel of Jesus: The Kingdom of God in Mediterranean Perspective.* Minneapolis: Fortress.

2001. *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology.* 3rd Ed. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Malina, Bruce J. and Jerome H. Neyrey.
1988. *Calling Jesus Names: The Social Values of Labels in Matthew.* Sonoma: Poleridge.

Malina, Bruce J., and Richard L. Rohrbaugh.
2003. *Social-Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels.* Minneapolis: Fortress.

Marshall, I. Howard ed.
1977. *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

1988. 'An assessment of recent developments.' Pages 1-21 in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF.* Edited by D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Martin, Francis.
1975. 'Image of the Shepherd in the Gospel of Saint Matthew.' *Science et esprit* 27:261-301.

Mason, Steve.
2003. *Josephus and the New Testament Second Edition.* Peabody: Hendrickson.

2003a. *Flavius Josephus: Life of Josephus.* Translation and Commentary. Leiden: Brill.

Massaux, E.
1990. *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature before Saint Irenaeus.* Macon: Mercer University Press.

Masson, Robert.
2001. 'Analogy and Metaphoric Process.' *Theological Studies* 62/3:571-96.

Massouk, Savir.
1983. 'Exegetical Holes: Psalms 95.' *Trinity Journal* 4: 84-88.

Matthews, Victor H.
1978. *Pastoral Nomadism in the Mari Kingdom.* Cambridge: American Schools of Oriental Research.

1981. 'Pastoralitsts and Patriarchs.' *The Biblical Archaeologist* 44: 215-18.

1991. *Manners and Customs in the Bible.* Peabody: Hendrickson.

Matthews, Victor H. and Don C. Benjamin.
1993. *Social World of Ancient Israel.* Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers.

1997 *Old Testament Parallels: Laws and Stories from the Ancient Near East.* New York: Paulist.

Matthews, V.H. and F. Mims.
1985. 'Jacob the Trickster and Heir of the Covenant: A Literary Interpretation.' *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 12: 185-95.

Mattingly, Gerald L.
1985. 'Shepherd.' Pages 941-942 in *Harpers Bible Dictionary.* Edited by Paul J Achtemeir. San Francisco: Harper and Row.

Mays, James Luther.
1976. *Micah: A Commentary.* Philadelphia: Westminster.

McConnel, R. S.
1969. *Law and Prophecy in Matthew's Gospel. The Authority and Use of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Matthew.* Theologische Dissertationen 2. Basel: Reinhardt.

McFague, Sallie.
1975. *Speaking in Parables.* London: SCM.

1982. *Metaphorical Theology: Models of God in Religious Language.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

1987. *Models of God: Theology for an Ecological Nuclear Age.* London: SCM.

McIver, Robert K.
1995. 'The Parable of the Weeds among the Wheat and the Relationship between the Kingdom and the Church as Portrayed in the Gospel of Matthew.' *Journal of Biblical Literature* 114: 643-59.

1998. 'The Place of the Matthean Community in the Stream of Early Christian History.' Pages 110-20 in *Ancient History in a Modern University: Vol. 2 Early Christianity, Late Antiquity and Beyond.* Edited by: T.W. Hillard et al. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

McKane, William.
1986. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah, Vol. 1, I-XXV.* The International Critical Commentary. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

1998. *The Book of Micah, Introduction and Commentary.* Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

McKnight, S.
1993. 'A Loyal Critic: Matthew's Polemic with Judaism in Theological perspective.' Pages 55-79 in *Anti-Semitism and Early Christianity: Issues of Polemic and Faith.* Edited by: Craig A. Evans and Donald A. Hagner. Minneapolis: Fortress.

McNamara, M.
1972. *Targum and Testament.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

McNight, Scot and Osborne, Grant R., eds.
2004. *The Face of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research.* Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Mebarki, Farah and Claude Grenache.
2000. 'The Qumran Library.' *Near Eastern Archaeology* 63/3:144-49

2000a. 'The Convictions of a Scholar: Interview with Emile Puech.' *Near Eastern Archaeology* 63/3:160-63.

Meeks, Wayne A.
1978. 'Jews and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries of the Common Era.' *Society of Biblicial Literature Sources for Biblical Study 13*. Missoula: Scholars.

1983. *The First Urban Christians*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

1974. 'Breaking Away: Three New Testament Pictures of Christianity's Separation from the Jewish Commnities.' Pages 93-116 in *To See Ourselves as Others See Us: Christians, Jews, 'Others' in Late Antiquity*. Edited by: J. Neusner and E. Frerichs. Chico: Scholars.

1986. *The Moral World of the First Christians*. Philadelphia: Westminster.

Meier, John P.
1977. 'Nations or Gentiles in Matthew 28:19?' *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 39: 94-102.

1991. *The Vision Of Matthew: Christ, Church, and Morality in the First Gospel*. New York: Crossroad.

1991a. 'Matthew and Ignatius: A Response to William R. Schoedel.' Pages 178-186 in *Social history of the Matthean Community: Cross-Disciplinary Approaches*. Edited by David L. Balch. Minneapolis: Fortress.

1992. *Matthew: New Testament Message, A Biblical-Theological Commentary, Vol.3*. Collegeville: Liturgical.

1996. 'Matthew, Gospel of.' Pages 622-41 in vol.4 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. . Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday.

2001. 'From Elijah-like Prophet to Royal Davidic Messiah.' Pages 45-83 in *Jesus: A Colloquium in the Holy Land*. Edited by Doris Donnelly. New York: Continuum.

Mendelson, Alan.
1988. *Philo's Jewish Identity*. Brown Judaic Studies 161. Atlanta: Scholars.

Mettinger, T.N.D.
1975. *King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings*. Lund: Wallin & Dalhom.

Metzger, B. M.
1982. 'The Fourth Book of Ezra.' *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha.* Edited by James H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday.

Meyer, Ben F.
1979. *The Aims of Jesus.* London: SCM.

1989. *Critical Realism and The New Testament.* San Jose: Pickwick.

1989a. 'The Primacy of the Intended Sense of Texts: Response by Kenneth R. Melchen and Afterword by Ben F. Meyer.' Pages 81-131 in *Lonergan's Hermeneutics: Its Development and Application.* Edited by Sean E. McEvenue and Ben F. Meyer. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press.

Meyers, Carol L. and Meyers, Eric M.
1993. *Zechariah 9-14: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary.* The Anchor Bible. Vol. 25C. Edited by William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday.

Miller, George A.
1979. 'Images and Models, Similes and Metaphors.' Pages 202-250 in *Metaphor and Thought.* Edited by Andrew Ortony. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Miller, Patrick D.
1986. *Interpreting the Psalms.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

Miller, Robert J. ed.
2001. *The Apocalyptic Jesus: A Debate.* Santa Rosa: Polebridge.

Milne, Pamela.
1974. 'Psalm 23: Echoes of the Exodus'. *Studies in Religion* 4:237-247.

Mitchell, William A.
1971. 'Movement and Pastoral Nomadism.' *The Rocky Mountain Social Science Journal* 8:63-72.

Moberly, R. W. L.
1992. 'Proclaiming Christ Crucified: Some Reflections on the Use and Abuse of the Gospels.' Pages 83-104 in *From Eden to Golgotha: Essays in Biblical Theology.* Atlanta: Scholars.

2000. 'Jesus in Matthew's Gospel as Son of God.' Pages 184-224 in *The Bible, Theology, and Faith: A Study of Abraham and Jesus.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mohammad, Abbas.
1973. 'The Nomadic and the Sedentary: Polar complementaries not polar opposites.' Pages 97-112 in *The Desert and the Sown: Nomads in the Wider Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Mohrlang, Roger.
1984. *Matthew and Paul: A Comparison of Ethical Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Montefiore C.G. and H. Loewe.
1974. *A Rabbinic Anthology*. New York: Schocken Books.

Moo, Douglas J.
1983. *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives.* Sheffield: Almond.

Moore, Carey A.
1992. *Judith: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible. Vol. 40. New York: Doubleday.

1992. 'Judith, Book of.' Pages 1117-1125 in vol. 3 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary.* Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday.

Moreen, Vera Basch.
1991. 'Moses, God's Shepherd: An Episode from a Judeo-Persian Epic'. *Prooftexts* 11:107-130.

Morgernstern, Julian.
1946. 'Psalm 23.' *Journal of Biblical Literature* 64:1:13-24.

Morrison, Martha A.
1983. 'Jacob and Laban Narrative in Light of Near Eastern Sources'. *The Biblical Archaeologist* 46:155-64.

Morrison, M.A. and D.I. Owen, eds.
1991. *Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Moss, Charlene McAfee.
2002. 'Zechariah and the Gospel of Matthew: The Use of Biblical Tradition'. Ph.D. diss./thesis, University of Durham.

Moule, C. F. D.
1962. *The Birth of the New Testament.* Harper & Row: New York.

Moyise, Steve.
2000. 'Intertextuality and the Study of the Old Testament in the New Testament'. Pages 13-41 in *The Old Testament in the New Testament: Essays in Honour of J. L. North.* Edited by S. Moyise. JSNTSup 189. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

2001. *The Old Testament in the New: An Introduction.* New York: T&T Clark.

Mulder, M. J. and Harry Sysling, eds.
1988. *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity.* Peabody: Hendrickson.

Mueller, James R.
1992. 'Acopcryphon of Ezekiel.' *The Anchor Bible Dictionary.* Volume 2: 709-711.

Muller, V.
1944. 'Prehistory of the "Good Shepherd"'. *Journal of Near Eastern studies* 3: 87-90.

Myers, Jacob M.
1974. *First and Second Esdras: Introduction, Translation and Commentary.* The Anchor Bible. Vol. 42. Garden City: Doubleday.

Neusner, Jacob.
1983. *Ancient Israel After Catastrophe: The Religious World View of the* Mishnah.
Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.
1988. *From Testament to Torah: An Introduction to Judaism in Its Formative Age*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

1991. 'Mr. Sanders' Pharisees and Mine: A Response to E.P. Sanders, Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah.' *Scottish Journal of Theology* 44: 73-95.

1992. *The Misnah.* New Jersey: Jason Aronson.

1994. *Introduction to Rabbinic Literature*. New York: Doubleday.

2002. *Judaism When Christianity Began.* Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

2002a *The Tosefta: Volume 1 & Volume 2*. Peabody: Hendrickson.

Neusner, Jacob and Ernest Frerichs, eds.
1985. *'To See Ourselves as Others See Us: Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity'.* Chico: Scholars.

Newman, Carey C. ed.
2000. *Jesus & the Restoration of Israel: A Critical Assessment of N.T. Wright's Jesus and The Victory of God.* Downers Grove: InterVarsity.

Newport, Kenneth G.C.
1995. *The Sources and Sitz im Leben of Matthew 23.* JSNTSup 117. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Neyrey, Jerome H.
1998. *Honor and Shame in the Gospel of Matthew.* Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

2001. 'The "Noble Shepherd" in John 10: Cultural and Rhetorical Background.' *Journal of Biblical Literature* 120/2:267-91.

Nickelsburg, George W. E.
1984. 'Baruch'. Pages 140-46 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period.* Edited by M. E. Stone. Philadelphia: Fortress.

2001. *1 Enoch 1.* Hermeneia-A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress.

2005. *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah.* Second Edition. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Nielsen, Kirsten.
1993. 'Shepherd, Lamb, and Blood: Imagery in the Old Testament.' *Studia Thological* 46/2:121-132.

2003. Variety of Metaphors about God in the Psalter.' *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 16/1:151-159.

Nolan, B.M.
1980. *The Royal Son of God: The Christology of Matthew 1-2 in the Setting of the Gospel.* Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Nolland, John.
1998. 'The Sources for Matthew 2:1-12' *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 60:283-300.

2005. *The New International Greek Testament Commentary: The Gospel of Matthew.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmens.

Norager, Troels.
1999. 'Heart' as Metaphor in Religious Discourse. Pages 215-232 in *Metaphor and God-talk.* Vol. 2 of *Religions and Discourse.* Edited by James Francis. New York: Peter Lang.

O'Day, G. R.
1999. 'Intertextuality.' Pages 546-548 in vol. 1, A-J, of *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation.* Gen. ed. John H. Hays. Nashville: Abingdon.

2001. 'Surprised by Faith: Jesus and the Canaanite Woman.' Pages 114-125 in *A Feminist Companion to Matthew.* Cleveland: Pilgrim.

Oden, Thomas C.
1983. *Pastoral Theology: Essentials of Ministry.* San Francisco: Harper and Row.

O'Flaherty, Wendy D.
n.d. 'Good and Evil Shepherd.' *Studies in the History of Religions* 50:169-91.

O'Grady, John F.
1978. 'Good Shepherd and the Vine and the Branches.' *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 8:86-96.

Ong, Walter J.
1982. *Orality and Literacy.* New York: Methum.

Orton, David E.
1989. *The Understanding Scribe: Matthew and the Apocalyptic Ideal.* JSNTSup 25. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Ortony, Andrew.
1975. 'Why Metaphors are necessary and not just nice.' *Educational Theory.* 25:45-42.

Ortony, Andrew ed.
1979. *Metaphor and Thought.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1979a. 'Metaphor: A Multidimensional Problem.' Pages 1-18 in *Metaphor and Thought.* Edited by Andrew Ortony. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1979b. 'The Role of Similarity in similes and Metaphors.' Pages 186-201 in *Metaphor and Thought.* Edited by Andrew Ortony. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1993. *Metaphor and Thought.* 2nd Ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1993a. 'Metaphor, language, and thought.' Pages 1-16 in *Metaphor and Thought.* 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Osiek, Carolyn.
1984. *What are they saying about the social setting of the New Testament?* New York: Paulist.

Overman, J. Andrew.
1990. 'Heroes and Villains in Palestinian Lore: Matthew's Use of Traditional Jewish Polemic in the Passion Narrative'. Pages 592-602 in *Society of Biblical Literature 1990 Seminar Papers*. Edited by: D.J. Lull. Atlanta: Scholars.

1990a. *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism: The Social World of the Matthean Community*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

1996. *Church and Community in Crisis*. Valley Forge: Trinity.

Paffenroth, Kim.
1999. 'Jesus as Anointed and Healing Son of David in the Gospel of Matthew'. *Biblica* 80:547-54.

Pardee, Dennis.
1972-75. 'A Restudy of the Commentary of Psalm 37 from Qumran Cave 4'. Pages 163-194 in Vol. 5 of *Revue de Qumran*.

Parker, D.C.
1997. *The Living Text of the Gospels*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parker-Taylor, G.H.
1973 *YAHWEH: The Divine Name in the Bible*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Pate, C. Marvin.
2000. *Communities of the Last Days*. Illinois: InterVarsity.

Patte, Daniel.
1975. *Early Jewish Hermeneutics in Palestine*. Dissertation Series, 22. Missoula: SBL and Scholars.

1987. *The Gospel According to Matthew: A Structural Commentary on Matthew's Faith*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Patterson, John.
1950. *The Praises of Israel*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Patterson, Sue.
1993. "Janet Martin Soskice, Metaphor and a Theology of Grace". *Scottish Journal of Theology* 46/1:1-26.

Paulien, Jon.
1988. 'Elusive Allusions: The Problematic Use of the Old Testament in Revelation'. *Biblical Research*. 33:37-53.

Pearson, B.A.
1991. *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester.* Minneapolis: Fortress.

Peck, George.
1978. 'Of Sheep and Shepherds.' *Andover Newton Quarterly* 19: 105-10.

Penner, T. C.
1999. 'Inner-Biblical Interpretation, New Testament'. Pages 540-543 in vol. 1, A-J, of *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation.* Gen. ed. John H. Hays. Nashville: Abingdon.

Pesch, Rudolf.
1975. *Das Markuseveanelium I. Teil. Einleitung und Kommentar zu Kap. 1,1-8,26. Herders Theologischer Kommentar Zum Neuen Testament.* Herausgegeben von Alfred Wikenhouser, Anton Vogtle, Rudolf Schnackenburg. Freiburg: Herder.

1993. '"He will be Called a Nazarene": Messianic Exegesis in Matthew 1-2.' Pages 129-78 in *The Gospel and the Scriptures of Israel.* Translated by Spencer Stadler. Edited by Craig A. Evans and Richard Stegner. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Petrotta, A. J.
1985. 'A Closer Look at Matt 2:6 and Its Old Testament Sources'. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 28/1: 47-52.

1990. 'An Even Closer Look at Matt 2:6 and Its Old Testament Sources'. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 33/3: 311-315.

Pilch, John.
2002. *Cultural Tools for Interpreting the Good News.* Collegeville: Liturgical.

Pilch, John and Bruce J Malina, eds.
1998. *Handbook of Biblical Social Values.* Rev. ed. Peabody: Hendrickson.

Pires de Oliveira, Roberta.
1999. ' "Mother in Heaven": A Desirable Metaphor?' Pages 134-152 in *Metaphor and God-talk.* Edited by L. Boeve and K Feyaerts. Vol. 2 of *Religions and Discourse.* Edited by James Francis. New York: Peter Lang.

Porter, Paul A.
1983. *Metaphors and Monsters.* Uppsala: CWK Gleerup.

Porter, Stanley E. ed.
1997. 'The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology.' Pages 79-96 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals.*

JSNTSup 148. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

2006. *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Postgate, J.N.
1975. 'Some Old Babylonian Shepherds and Their Flocks.' *Journal of Semitic Studies* 20:1-21.

Powell, Mark Allen.
1988. *The Religious Leaders in Matthew: A Literary Critical Approach.* Ph.D. diss., Union Theological Seminary.

1990. *What is Narrative Criticism*? Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

1981. 'Toward a Narrative-Critical Understanding of Matthew.' *Interpretation* 46/4:341-346.

1995a. *God With Us: A Pastoral Theology of Matthew's Gospel.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

1995b. 'Narrative Criticism.' Pages 239-255 in *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation.* Edited by Joel B. Green. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

1998. 'Matthew as Pastor: The Presence of God.' *Word and World* 18/4:348-354.

2000. 'The Magi as Kings: An Adventure in Reader-Response Criticism.' *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 62:459-80.

Pritchard, James B.
1969. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts: Relating to the Old Testament.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Prinsloo, G.T.M.
1997. 'Shepherd, Vine-Grower, Father – Divine Metaphor and Existential Reality in a Community Lament.' *Old Testament Essays* 10/2: 279-302.

Pryke, E. J.
1967-68. '*IDE* and *IDOU*.' *New Testament Studies* 14:418-24.

Pryzybylski, Benno.
1980. *Righteousness In Matthew And His World Of Thought.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

1988. 'The Setting of Matthean Anti Judaism.' Pages 181-200 in *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity, vol. I.* Edited by: P. Richardson and O. Granskou. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier.

Quasten, Johannes.
1947. 'The Painting of the Good Shepherd at Dura-Europa.' *Mediaeval Studies* 9:1-18.

Rabinowitz, I.
1964. 'The alleged Orphism of 11Q Pss col. 28, 3-12'. Pages 193-200 in *Zietschrift fur Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.*

Radman, Zdravko.
1999. "In the Name of God: Towards a Concept of Virtual Meaning." Pages 127-134 in *Metaphor and God-talk.* Edited by L. Boeve and K Feyaerts. Vol. 2 of *Religions and Discourse.* Edited by James Francis. New York: Peter Lang.

Rahner, Karl.
1975. 'The Theology of the Symbol.' Pages 221-252 in *Theological Investigations. Vol. IV.* New York: Crossroad.

Rajak, Tessa.
1975. *Josephus: The Historian and His Society.* London: Duckworth.

1994. 'The Jewish Community and its Boundaries.' Pages 9-28 in *The Jews among Pagans and Christians.* Edited by J. Lieu, J. North and T. Rajak. London: Routledge.

Ramsey, Ian T.
1961. 'On the Possibility and Purpose of a Metaphysical Theology.' Pages 178-205 in *Prospect For Metaphysics: Essays of Metaphysical Exploration.* Edited by Ian Ramsey. London: Unwin Brothers Limited.

1963a. *Religious Language.* New York: Macmillan.

1963b. *On Being Sure in Religion.* London: Athlone.

1964. *Models and Mystery.* London: Oxford University Press.

1971. *Words About God: The Philosophy of Religion.* San Francisco: Harper and Row.

1973. *Models for Divine Activity.* London: SCM.

1974a. *Christian Empiricism.* Edited by Jerry H. Gill. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

1974b. 'Talking of God: Models, Ancient and Modern.' Pages 120-140 in *Christian Empiricism.* Edited by Jerry H. Gill. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Ramshaw, E.J.
1998. 'Power and Forgiveness in Mt. 18.' *Word and World* 18/4:397-404.

Redditt, Paul L.
1989. 'Israel's Shepherds: Hope and Pessimism in Zechariah 9-14.' *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 51:631-42.

1995. 'Zerubbabel, Joshua and the Night Visions of Zechariah.' *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 54:249-59.

1993. 'The Two Shepherds in Zechariah 11:4-17.' *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 55/4: 676-86.

Reddy, Michael J.
1993. 'The conduit metaphor: A case of frame conflict in our language about language.' Pages 164-201 in *Metaphor and Thought.* 2nd Ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Reid, S.B.
1979. *Enoch and Daniel: A Form Critical and Sociological Study of the Historical Apocalypses.* Berkeley: Bible.

Richards, I. A.
1936. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Riches, John.
1996. *Matthew*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Ricoeur, Paul.
1976. *Interpretation Theory.* Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press.

1977. *The Rule of the Metaphor*. Translated by Robert Czerny with Kathleen McLaughlin and John Costello, SJ. Buffalo: University of Toronto Press. Translation of *La metaphore vive.* Editions du Seuil, 1975.

1979. 'The Metaphorical Process as Cognition, Imagination, and Feeling.' Pages 141-158 in *On Metaphor*. Edited by Sheldon Sacks. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

1984. *The Reality of the Historical Past*. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press.

1996. *Figuring the Sacred: Religion, Narrative, and Imagination.* Minneapolis: Fortress.

Rihbany, Abraham Mitrie.
1916. *The Syrian Christ.* New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Roberts, J.J.M.
1987. 'In Defense of the Monarchy: The Contribution of Israelite Kinship to Biblical Theology.' Pages 377-96 in *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross.* Edited by Patrick D. Miller, Jr., Paul D. Hanson, S. Dean McBride Philadelphia: Fortress.

Robbins, Vernon K.
1994. 'Socio-Rhetorical Criticism: Mary, Elizabeth and the Magnificat as a Test Case.' Pages 164-209 in *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament.* Edited by Elizabeth Struthers Malbon and Edgar V. McKnight. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity.

1996. *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation.* Harrisburg, PA: Trinity.

Robinson, James M., P. Hoffman and J.S. Kloppenborg, eds.
2001. *The Critical Edition of Q.* Hermeneia-A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible: Supplements. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Rohrbaugh, Richard ed.
1996. *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation.* Peabody: Hendrickson.

Rooke, Deborah W.
1998. 'Kingship as Priesthood: The Relationship Between the High Priest and the Monarchy.' Pages 187-208 in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar.* Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 270. Edited by John Day. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Rosenberg, R. A.
1972. 'The "Star of the Messiah" Reconsidered.' *Biblica* 53:105-109.

Rosenmeyer, T. G.
1962. 'Plato's Prayer to PAN.' *Hermes* 90:34-44.

Rothfuchs, Wilhelm.
1969. *Die Erfullungszitate des Matthaus-Evangeliums: Eine beblisch-theologische Untersuchung.* Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Rowland, C. C.
1994. 'Apocalyptic, Poor, and Gospel of Matthew.' *Journal of Theological Studies* 45:504-18.

Ryken, Leland.
1982. 'Metaphor in the Psalms.' *Christianity & Literature* 31/3: 9-29.

1992. *Words of Delight: A Literary Introduction to the Bible.* Grand Rapids: Baker.

Sabbe, M.
1991. 'John 10 and Its Relationship to the Synoptic Gospels.' Pages 75-93 in *The Shepherd Discourse of John 10 and its Context.* Society for New Testament Studies 67. Edited by Johannes Beutler, S.J. and Robert Fortna. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, Sheldon.
1979. *On Metaphor*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Saldarini, Anthony J.
1991. 'The Gospel of Matthew and Jewish-Christian Conflict.' Pages 38-61 in *Social history of the Matthean Community: Cross-Disciplinary Approaches*. Edited by David L. Balch. Minneapolis: Fortress.

1992. 'The Delegitimation of Leaders in Matt. 23.' *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 54:659-80.

1992a. 'The Gospel of Matthew and Jewish-Christian Conflict in the Galilee.' Pages 23-38 in *The Galilee in Late Antiquity*. Edited by: L.I. Levine. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

1994. *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

1997. 'Demonization and Polemics.' *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 34:339-40.

1998. *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

1999. 'Asceticism and the Gospel of Matthew.' Pages 11-27 in *Asceticism and the New Testament*. Edited by Leif E. Vaage and Vincent L. Wimbush. New York: Routledge.

2001. 'Reading Matthew without Anti-Semitism.' Pages 166-184 in *The Gospel of Matthew in Current Study*. Edited by David E. Aune. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

2001a. 'Absent Women in Matthew's Households.' Pages 157-170 in *A Feminist Companion of Matthew*. Edited by Amy-Jill Levine. Cleveland: Pilgrim.

Sand, Alexander.
1986. *Das Evangelium nach Matthaus*. Regensburg: Pustet.

Sanders, J. A.
1963. *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11Qpsa)*. DJD IV. Oxford: Clarendon.

1967. *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

1974. 'The Qumran Psalms Scrolls Reviewed.' Pages 79-100 in *On Language, Culture, and Religion: In Honor of Eugene A. Nida*. Edited by M.Black and W.A. Smalley. Paris.

1975. *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text.* Edited by F. M. Cross and S. Talmon. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Sanders, E. P.
1977. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion.* London: SCM.

1985. *Jesus and Judaism.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

1990. *Jewish Law From Jesus to the Mishnah.* Philadelphia: Trinity.

Sandt, Van De Huub ed.
2005. *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?* Minneapolis: Fortresss.

Sarna, Nahum M.
1991. *Exodus.* The JPS Torah Commentary. Edited by Nahum Sarna and Chaim Potok. Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society.

Satherwaite, Philip E., Richard S. Hess, and Gordon J. Wenham, eds.
1995. *The Lord's Anointed. Interpretation of Old Testament Messianic Texts.* Grand Rapids: Baker.

Schaefer, Konrad R.
1997. 'Zechariah 14: A Study in Allusion.' *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 57:66-91.

Schams, Christine.
1998. *Jewish Scribes in the Second-Temple Period.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Schenck, Kenneth.
2005. *A Brief Guide to Philo.* Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Schiffman, Lawerence H.
1981. 'At the Crossroads: Tannaitic Perspectives on the Jewish-Christian Schism.' Pages 115-56 in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition, vol. II: Aspects of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman Period.* London: SCM.

1993. *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society.

2000. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the History of Judaism." *Near Eastern Archaeology* 63/3:154-49.

Schiffman, Lawerence H. and James C. VanderKam, eds.
2000. *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls.* 2 Vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf.
2002. *The Gospel According to Matthew.* Trans. by Robert R. Barr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Schniedewind, W.M.
1993. 'Are We His People or Not? Biblical Interpretation during Crisis'. *Biblica* 76: 545-50.

Schuller, Eileen.
1999. 'Petitionary Prayer and the Religion of Qumran'. Pages 29-54 in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Grand Rapids: Erdmans.

Schurer, Emil.
1973. Vol. I
1979. Vol. II
1986. Vol. III, Part 1
1987. Vol. III, Part 2 *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ.* A New English Version Revised and Edited by Geza Vermes, et al. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Schweitzer, Albert.
1950. *The Quest of the Historical Jesus.* New York: Macmillan.

Schweizer, Eduard.
1975. *The Good News According To Matthew.* Atlanta: John Knox.

Searle, John R.
1979. 'Metaphor.' Pages 92-123 in *Metaphor and Thought.* Edited by Andrew Ortony. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sedgwick, Colin J.
1997. 'Shepherd, Brother, Friend.' *Expository Times* 108: 182-83.

Segal, A.F.
1991. 'Matthew's Jewish Community.' Pages 8-23 in *Social History of the Matthean Community.* Edited by David L. Balch. Minneapolis: Fortress.

1991a. 'Matthew's Jewish Voice.' Pages 3-37 in *Social History of the Matthean Community: Cross-Disciplianry Approaches.* Edited by D.L. Balch. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Senior, Donald.
1974. 'A Case Study in Matthean Creativity: Matthew 27:3-10.' *Biblical Research* 19:23-36.

1975. *The Passion Narrative of Matthew: A Redactional Study.* Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, XXXIX.

1985. *The Passion of Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew.* Wilmington: Glazier.

1987. 'Matthew's Special Material in the Passion Story: Implications for the Evangelist's Redactional Technique and Theological Perspective.' *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 63: 272-94.

1992. 'Matthew 2:1-12.' *Interpretation* 46/4:395-97.

1992a. 'Matthew's Account of the Burial of Jesus.' Pages 1443-48 in *The Four Gospels 1992*. Edited by F. Van Segbroeck et al. Vol. 2. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

1996. *What are they saying about Matthew?* New York: Paulist.

1997. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Nashville: Abingdon.

1997a. 'The Lure of the Formula Quotations Re-Assessing Matthew's Use of the Old Testament with the Passion Narrative as Test Case.' Pages 89-115 in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by Christopher Tuckett. *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium: CXXXI*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

1998. 'The Gospel of Matthew and the Passion of Jesus: Theological and Pastoral Perspectives.' *Word and World* 18/4:372-79.

1998a. 'Matthew's Gospel as Ethical Guide.' *The Bible Today* 36/5:273-79.

1998b. *Matthew*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon.

1999. 'Between Two Worlds: Gentiles and Jewish Christians in Matthew's Gospel.' *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 61/1:1-23.

2001. 'Directions in Matthean Studies.' Pages 5-21 in *The Gospel of Matthew in Current Study*. Edited by David E. Aune. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Shanks, Hershel ed.

1999. *Ancient Israel: Revised & Expanded*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.

Shelp, E.E. and L. Sunderland, eds.

1981. *A Biblical Basis for Ministry*. Philadelphia: Westminster.

Shepherd, Massey H.

1956. 'Epistle of James and the Gospel of Matthew.' *Journal of Biblical Literature* 75:40-51.

Sibinga, J.S.

1966. 'Ignatius and Matthew.' *Novum Testamentum* 8:263-83.

Sim, David C.
1995. 'The Gospel of Matthew and the Gentiles.' *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 57: 19-48.

1996. *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew*. SNTS 88. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1996a. 'Christianity and Ethnicity in the Gospel of Matthew.' Pages 171-95 in *Ethnicity and the Bible*. Edited by M.G. Brett. Leiden: Brill.

1998. *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

2003. 'The Defensibility of Christian Judaism.' Pages 57-72 in *Prayer and Spirituality in the Early Church. Vol. 3: Liturgy and Life*. Edited by Bronwen Neil, Geoffrey D. Dunn and Lawrence Cross. Strathfield, Australia: St Pauls.

Skeltan, Patrick W.
1976. 'Again the Syriac Apocryphal Psalms'. Pages 143-58 in *Catholic Biblical Quarterly 38.*

1988. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes*. Anchor Bible Series. Vol. 39. New York: Doubleday.

Smith, George Adam.
1980. *Four Psalms.* New Canaan: Keats.

Smith, M.S.
1997. 'How to Write a Poem: The Case of Psalm 151A.' Pages 182-208 in *The Hebrew of The Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira.* Edited by T. Muraoka and J.F. Elwolde. New York: Brill.

Smith, Ralph L.
1984. 'Micah-Malachi. Vol. 32. *Word Biblical Commentary.* Edited by David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker. Nashville: Thomas Nelson.

Smith, R.H.
1998. 'Blessed Are the Poor in (Holy) Spirit.' *Word and World* 18/4:389-96.

Smith, R.R.R.
1988. '*Simulacra Gentium*: The *Ethne* from the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias.' *Journal of Roman Studies* 78:50-77.

Snodgrass, Klyne R.
1988. 'Matthew and the Law.' Pages 536-54 in *Society of Biblical Literature 1988 Seminar Papers*. Edited by D.J. Lull. Atlanta: Scholars.

1992. 'Matthew's Understanding of the Law.' *Interpretation* 46/4:368-378.

Soares Prabhu, G. M.
1976. *The Formula Quotations in the Infancy Narrative of Matthew.* Analecta Biblica 63. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.

Soggin, J.A.
1997 'רעה: to tend.' Pages 1246-48 in vol. 3 of *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament.* Edited by Ernst Jenni and Claus Westermann. 3 vols. Peabody: Hendrickson.

Sohn, Seock-Tae.
1991. *The Divine Election of Israel.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Sontag, F.
1991. 'Metaphorical Non-Sequitur.' *Scottish Journal of Theology* 44:1-18.

Soskice, Janet Martin.
1985. *Metaphor and Religious Language.* Oxford: Clarendon.

Soucek, J.B.
1956-57. 'Good shepherd and his flock.' *The Ecumenical Review* 9:143-53.

Spacq, Ceslas.
1994. *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament.* 3 vols. Peabody: Hendrickson.

Sparks, Kenton L.
2007. *Ancient Texts for the Study of the Hebrew Bible: A Guide to the Background Literature.*
Peabody: Hendrickson.

Spilsbury, Paul J.
1998. 'God and Israel in Josephus: A Patron Client Relationship' Pages 172-91 in *Understanding Josephus: Seven Perspectives.* Edited by Steve Mason. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplemental Series 32. Sheffield: Sheffield Acad. Press.

Stanley, David Michael.
1961. 'I am the good shepherd.' *Worship* 35: 287-93.

Stanton, Graham.
1983. *The Interpretation Of Matthew.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

1984. 'The Gospel of Matthew and Judaism.' *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 66: 264-84.

1985. 'The Origin and Purpose of Matthew's Gospel. Matthean Scholarship from 1945 to 1980.' Pages 1889-1951 in *ANRW II.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

1992. *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew*. Louisville: John Knox.

1992a. 'The Communities of Matthew.' *Interpretation* 46/4:379-391.

1992b. 'Matthew's Christology and the Parting of the Ways.' Pages 99-116 in *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, A.D. 70 to 135*. Edited by James D. G. Dunn. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

1992c. 'Matthew: *BIBLOS, EUANGELION,* or *BIOS*?' Pages 1187-1201 in *The Four Gospels 1992*. Edited by F. Van Segroeck et al. Vol. 2. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

1992d. 'Matttew 11:28-30: Comfortable Words?' Pages 364-77 in *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

1996. 'Revisiting Matthew's communities.' *Hervormde teologiese studies* 52/2-3:376-94.

2002. *The Gospels and Jesus*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

2004. *Jesus and Gospel*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Stark, Rodney.

1991. 'Antioch as the Social Situation for Matthew's Gospel.' Pages 189-210 in *Social history of the Matthean Community: Cross-Disciplinary Approaches*. Edited by David L. Balch. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Stegner, William Richard.

1998. 'Leadership and Governance in the Matthean Community.' Pages 147-157 in *Common Life in the Early Church: Essays Honoring Graydon F. Snyder*. Edited by Julian V. Hills. Harrisburg: Trinity.

Stein, Robert H.

1987. *The Synoptic Problem: An Introduction*. Grand Rapids: Baker.

1995. *The Method and Message of Jesus' Teaching*. Rev ed. Minneapolis: Westminster John Knox.

2001. *Studying the Synoptic Gospels: Origin and Interpretation*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Stendahl, Krister.

1968. *The School of St. Matthew*. Revised Edition. Ramsey: Sigler.

1983. '"*Quis et Unde*?" An Analysis of Matthew 1—2'. Pages 56-66 in G.N. Stanton, ed., *The Interpretation of Matthew*. Edited by G. N. Stanton. London: SPCK.

Stern, Josef.

2000. *Metaphor in Context*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Stern, Philip D.
1994. 'Bloodbath of Anat and Psalm 23.' *Vetus testamentum* 44: 120-25.

Steudel, Annette and Claude Grenache.
2000. 'The Search for Lost Texts.' *Near Eastern Archaeology* 63/3:150-51.

Stock, Augustine.
1994. *The Method and Message of Matthew*. Collegeville: Liturgical.

Stone, Michael Edward.
1979. 'The Book of Enoch and Judaism in the Third Centery BCE'. Page 479-492 in *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Vol. 40.*

1983. *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

1984. 'Apocalyptic Literature.' Pages 383-441 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period.* Edited by Michael E. Stone. Philadelphia: Fortress.

1990. *Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra.* Hermeneia-A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Philadelphia: Fortress.

1992. 'Second Book of Edras'. *The Anchor Bible Dictionary.* Volume 2: 611-614.

Storfjell, J.
1987. 'Chiastic Structure of Psalm 151.' *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 25: 97-106.

Stowers, Stanley K.
1986. *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity.* Library of Early Christianity no 5. Edited by Wayne A. Meeks. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Strack, H. L. and P. Billerbeck.
1951-1956. *Kommentar zum neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch.* 4 vols. 3rd ed. Munich: Beck.

Strack, H.L. and Gunter Stemberger.
1991. *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash.* Minneapolis: Fortress.

Strecker, Georg.
1966. *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit: Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthaus.* FRLANT 82. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

1967. 'Matthew's Understanding of History.' *Journal of the American Academy of Religion.* 35:219-230.

1972. 'On the Problem of Jewish Christianity.' Pages 241-85 in *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity.* W. Bauer. London: SCM.

Streeter, Burnett Hillman.
1924. *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins.* London: Macmillan.

1929. *The Primitive Church.* New York: Macmillan.

Strugnell, John.
1965. 'More Psalms of "David"'. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 27:207-216.

1969-1971. 'Notes en marge du volume V des Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan.' Pages 211-218 in *Revue de Qumran 7.*

2000. 'Qumranology then and now'. *Near Eastern Archaeology* 63/3:175-76.

Stuhlmacher, Peter.
1972. 'Epiphanias: Matthaus 2, 1-12'. *Gottinger Predigtmeditation* 27:63-70.

Stuhlmacher, Peter ed.
1991. *The Gospel and the Gospels.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Suggs, M. Jack.
1970. *Wisdom, Christology, and Law in Matthew's Gospel.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Sundberg, A. C.
1959. 'On Testimonies.' *Novum Testamentum* 3:268-281.

Swineburne, Richard G.
1992. *Revelation: From Metaphor to Analogy.* Oxford: Clarendon.

1999. 'Analogy, metaphor, and religious language.' Pages 63-74 in *Metaphor and God-talk.* Vol. 2 of *Religions and Discourse.* Edited by James Francis. New York: Peter Lang.

Talbert, Charles H.
1977. *What is a Gospel?* Philadelphia: Fortress.

1978. 'Oral and Independent or Literary and Interdependent? A Response to Albert B. Lord.' Pages 93-102 in *The Relationships Among the Gospels.* Edited by: William O. Walker, Jr. San Antonio: Trinity University Press.

2001. 'Indicative and Imperative in Matthean Soteriology.' *Biblica* 82/4: 515-38.

2004. *Reading the Sermon on the Mount: Character Formation and Decision-Making in Matthew 5-7.* Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.

Tapper, Richard L.
1991. 'The Organization of Nomadic Communities in Pastoral Societies of the Middle East.' Pages 43-65 in *Pastoral Production and Society: Proceedings of the international meeting on Nomadic Pastoralism, Paris 1-3 Dec. 1976.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tappy, Ron.
1995. 'Psalm 23: Symbolism and Structure.' Pages 255-80 in *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Vol.* 57.

Terrien, Samuel.
2003. *The Psalms: Strophic Structure and Theological Commentary.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Theissen, Gerd.
1977. *Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

Thiering, B.E.
1981. '*MEBAQQER* and *EPISKOPOS* in the Light of the Temple Scroll.' *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100:59-74.

Thiselton, Anthony C.
1980. *The Two Horizons.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

1992. *New Horizons in Hermeneutics.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Thomson, J.G.S.S.
1955. 'Shepherd-Ruler concept in the Old Testament and its Application in the New Testament.' *Scottish Journal of Theology* 8: 406-18.

Thompson, J. A.
1977. *The Book of Jeremiah.* The New International Commentary on the Old Testament.
Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Thompson, William G.
1970. *Matthew's Advice to a Divided Community.* Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.

1974. 'An Historical Perspective in the Gospel of Matthew.' *Journal of Biblical Literature* 93:243-62.

1989. *Matthew's Story.* Mahwah, NJ: Paulist.

Thurneysen, Eduard.
1964. *The Sermon on the Mount.* Richmond: John Knox.

Tidball, Derek J.
1986. *Skillful Shepherds: An Introduction to Pastoral Theology.* Leicester:

InterVarsity.

Tilborg, S. van.
1972. *The Jewish Leaders in Matthew*. Leiden: Brill.

Tiller, Patrick.
1993. *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of I Enoch*. Atlanta: Scholars.

Tooley, W.
1964. 'Shepherd and sheep image in the teaching of Jesus.' *Novum Testamentum* 7: 15-25.

Trafton, Joseph L.
1975. 'Psalms of Solomon.' *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Volume 6: 115-117.

Tracy, David.
1979. 'Metaphor and Religion: The Test Case of Christian Texts.' Pages 89-104 in *On Metaphor*. Edited by Sheldon Sacks. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

1981. *The Analogical Imagination: Christian Theology and the Culture of Pluralism*. New York: Crossroad.

Tuckett, Christopher.
1997. 'The Scripture and Q.' Pages 3-26 in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by Christopher Tuckett. *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium: CXXXI*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

2001. *Christology and the New Testament*. Louisville: Westminster.

2001a. 'The Son of Man and Danial 7: Q and Jesus.' Pages 371-394 in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*. Edited by A. Lindemann. *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium: CLVIII*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Truex, Jerry Duane.
2002. 'The Problem of Blasphemy: The Fourth Gospel and Early Jewish Understandings'. Ph.D. diss./thesis, University of Durham.

Uro, Risto.
1987. *Sheep Among the Wolves: A Study on the Mission Instructions of Q*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.

Van Aarde, Andreis G.
1994. *God-With-Us: The Dominant Perspective in Matthew's Story. Hervormde teologiese studeis* Sup 5. Pretoria: University of Pretoria Press

Van Noppen, Jean-Pierre.
1999. 'Christian Theographic Metaphors: Ordinary Words with Extraordinary Meanings.' Pages 95-112 in *Metaphor and God-talk.* Edited by L. Boeve and K. Feyaerts. Vol. 2 of *Religions and Discourse.* Edited by James Francis. New York: Peter Lang.

Van Segbroeck, Frans.
1972. 'Les citations d'accomplissement dans l'Evangile selon saint Matthieu.' Pages 131-52 in *L`Evangile selon Matthieu. Redaction et theologie. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 29.* Edited by M. Didier. Gembloux: Duculot.

Vancil, Jack W.
1992. 'Sheep, Shepherd.' Pages 1187-90 in vol. 5 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary.* Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday.

Vanderkam, James C.
1996. 'The use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1-8, 19-20.' *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 58:503-04.

2000. 'Messianism and Apocalypticism.' Pages 193-228 in vol. 1 of *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity.* Edited by John J. Collins. 3 vols. London: Continuum.

2001. *An Introduction to Early Judaism.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Vanderkam, James C. and Peter Flint.
2002. *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity.* San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco.

VanGemeren, Willem.
1997. *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis: Vol 1-3.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Van Hecke, Pierre.
2001. 'Shepherds and Linguists. A Cognitive-Linguistic Approach to the Metaphor "God is Shepherd" in Gen. 48:15 and Context.' Pages 479-493 in *Studies in the Book of Genesis. Literature, Redaction and History.* Edited by A. Wenien. Vol. 155 of Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium. Leuven: University Press-Peeters.

2002. 'Lamentations 3:1-6.' *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 16/2: 264-282.

2003. 'Living Alone in the Shrubs: Positive Pastoral Metaphors in Micah 7:14.' *Zeitschrift fur die alttestamentliche Wisseschaft* 115/3: 362-375.

2006. 'To Shepherd, Have Dealings and Desire: On the Lexical Structure of the Hebrew Root *r'h.'* Pages 37-53 in *The Bible through Metaphor and Translation: A Cognitive Semantic Perspective*. Edited by Kurt Feyaerts. Vol. 15 of *Religions and Discourse.* Edited by James M. M. Francis. New York: Peter Lang.

Van Segbroeck, F. ed.
1992. *The Four Gospels 1992*. Vol. 2. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Venter, P.M.
1995. 'Daniel and Enoch: Two Different Reactions.' *Harvard theological studies* 53/2:68-91.

Verheyden, J.
1990. 'The Flight of the Christians to Pella.' *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 66:368-84.

Vermes, Geza
1997. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. New York: Penguin.

1999. *An Introduction to the Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Verseput, Donald J.
1984. 'The Role and Meaning of the "Son of God" Title in Matthew's Gospel.' *New Testament Studies* 33:532-56.

1995. 'The Davidic Messiah and Matthew's Jewish Christianity.' *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers*, 102-16.

Viviano, Benedict T.
1979. 'Where Was the Gospel according to St. Matthew Written?' *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 41: 533-46.

1983. 'Matthew, Master of Ecumenical Healing.' *Currents in Theology and Mission* 10: 325-32.

1990. 'Social World and Community Leadership: The Case of Matthew 23:1-12, 34.' *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 39:3-21.

1990. 'The Genres of Matthew 1-2: Light from Timothy 1:4.' *Revue biblique* 97: 31-53.

Vogt, E.
1953. 'The "Place in Life" of Ps. 23'. *Biblica* 34: 195-211.

von Rad, Gerhard.
1962. *Old Testament Theology: Volume 1: The Theology of Israel's Historical Traditions*. New York: Harper & Row.

Wainwright, Elaine M.
1998a. 'Tradition Markers/Tradition Shapers: Women of the Mt. Tradition.' *Word and World* 18/4:380-88.

1998b. *Shall We Look for Another? A Feminist Rereading of the Matthean Jesus*. Maryknoll: Orbis.

Walcot, Peter.
1979. 'Cattle Raiding Heroic Tradition and Ritual: The Greek Evidence.' *History of Religions 18:326-51.*

Waldman, Nahum M.
1978. 'The Breaking of the Bow.' *Jewish Quarterly Review.* 167/??: 82-88.

Walker, William O. ed
1978. *The Relationship Among the Gospels: An Interdisciplinary Dialogue.* San Antonio: Trinity University Press.

Wallace, Daniel B.
2003. 'The Synoptic Problem.' 31 pages. Cited January 2004. Online: http://www.netbible.org/docs/soapbox/synoptic.htm

Wallace, James K.
1960. 'The Basque Sheepherder and the Shepherd Psalm.' *The Reader's Digest.* July 1960:179-84.

Watts, John D.W.
1987. *Isaiah 34-66. Vol 25.* Word Biblical Commentary. Edited by John D.W. Watts. Waco: Word.

Weaver, Dorothy Jean.
1990. *Matthew's Missionary Discourse: A Literary Critical Analysis.* JSNTSSup 38. Sheffield: JSOT.

1992. 'Matthew 28:1-10.' *Interpretation.* 46/4:398-401.

Weber, Kathleen.
1997. 'The Image of Sheep and Goats in Matthew 25:31-46. Pages 657-678 in *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 59.*

Weiser, Artur.
1962. *The Psalms*. Philadelphia: Westminster.

Wenham, Gordon J.
1987. *Genesis 1-15*. Word Biblical Commentary. Dallas: Word.

White, Michael L.
1991. 'Crisis Management and Boundary Maintenance: The Social Location of the Matthean Community.' Pages 211-247 in *Social history of the Matthean Community: Cross-Disciplinary Approaches.* Edited by David L. Balch. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Whitelam, Keith W.
1992. 'King and Kingship.' Pages 40-48 in vol. 4 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary.* Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. Garden City: Doubleday.

Wildman, Wesley J.
1999. 'Strategic Mechanisms within Religious Symbol Systems.' Pages 273-291 in *Metaphor and God-talk.* Edited by L. Boeve and K Feyaerts. Vol. 2 of *Religions and Discourse.* Edited by James Francis. New York: Peter Lang.

Wiles, John Keating.
1989. 'Shepherds, Flock, and the Shepherd – Text: Ezekiel 34:11.' *Faith and Mission* 7:79-82.

Wilkens, Michael J. and Terence Paige, eds.
1992. *Worship, Theology and Ministry in the Early Church.* England: Sheffield Academic Press.

Wills, L.M.
2001. 'Scribal Methods in Matthew and *Mishnah Abot.' Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 63/2:241-257.

Wilson, Gerald H.
1985. 'The Qumran Psalm Manuscripts and the Hebrew Psalter: 1. Preliminary Question.' Pages 63-92 in *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter.* Chico: Scholars.

1997. 'The Qumran Psalms Scroll and the Canonical Psalter: Comparison of Editoral Shaping.' *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 59:448-64.

Wilson, M.
1979. 'On Investigating the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament.' Pages 231-243 in *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black.* Edited by E. Best and R. McL. Wilson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Winstanley, M.T.
1986. 'Shepherd Image in the Scriptures.' *The Clergy Review* 71:197-206.

Winston, David.
1979. *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and*

Commentary. The Anchor Bible. Vol. 43. Garden City: Doubleday.

Wold, B. J.
2005. 'Non-Explicit Use of Biblical Traditions: Methodology for Identification.' Pages 43-79 in *Women, Men and Angels: The Qumran Wisdom Document Masor leMevin and it's Allusion to Genesis Creation Traditions.* WUNT 2:201. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Wolff, Hans Walter.
1990. *Micah: A Commentary.* Minneapolis: Augsburg.

Wolfson, H.A.
1975. *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Wong, K.C.
1991. 'The Matthean Understanding of the Sabbath: A Response to G.N. Stanton.' *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 44: 211-47.

Woollcombe, K. L.
1957. 'The Biblical Origins and Patristic Development of Typology' Pages 39-75 in *Essays on Typology*, Edited by G. W. H. Lamp and K. L. Woollcombe. London: SCM.

Wright, G.E.
1939. 'Good Shepherd.' *The Biblical Archaeologist.* 2:44-48.

Wright, John.
1975. 'Did Amos Inspect Livers.' *Australian Biblical Review.* 23: 3-11.

Wright, N. T.
1992. *The New Testament And The People of God.* Minneapolis: Fortress.

1996. *Jesus and the Victory of God.* Minneapolis: Fortress.

1997. 'Thy Kingdom Come: Living the Lord's Prayer.' *The Christian Century* 114/9:268-70.

1998. *The Challenge of Jesus: Rediscovering Who Jesus Was and Is*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity.

2003. *The Resurrection of the Son of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Young, F.
1994. 'Typology.' Pages 29-48 in *Crossing the Boundaries: Essays in Biblical Interpretation in Honour of Michael D. Goulder.* Edited by S. E. Porter et al. New York: Brill.

1997. *Biblical Exegesis and the formation of Christian Culture.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zimmerli, Walter.

1979. *Ezekiel 1: Chapter 1-24.*

1983. *Ezekiel 2: Chapter 25-48. A Commentary of the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel.* Hermeneia- A Critical and Historical Commentary of the Bible. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Zonana, Gustavo.

1999. 'On the Names of God: Notes on the Construction of Interpretive Frames for Religious Language.' Pages 45-62 in *Metaphor and God-talk.* Edited by L. Boeve and K Feyaerts. Vol. 2 of *Religions and Discourse.* Edited by James Francis. New York: Peter Lang.